DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 523 EC 103 596

AUTHOR	Niederer, Margaret, Ed.
TITLE	Media/Information/Services for Exceptional Students.
PUB DATE	Sep 77
NOTE	84p.
JOURNAL CIT	Illinois Libraries; v59 n7 Sep77
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Delivery Systems; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Legislation; *Gifted; *Handicapped Children; *Information Services; *Instructional Materials; *Instructional Media; Library Services; School Services
IDENTIFIERS	*Education for All Handicapped Children Act; Illinois

ABSTRACT

Presented are 18 articles on media/library systems and services for handicapped and gifted students. Entries include the following titles and authors: "Implications of Public Law 94-142" (Education for All Handicapped Children Act) by G. Calovini; "Mainstreaming--Present Shock" by L. Stowell and C. Terry; "Media Services for Exceptional Children--Some Current Practices in Illinois" by D. Adcock; "Program Development and the Gifted Area Service Centers" by J. Stark; "Teacher Centers and P.L. 94-142--A Unique Opportunity for Cooperation and Resource Utilization" by M. Estle and C. Christensen; "Them as Can, Does" by R. Ehret; "A Program to Enable Visually Impaired Students in Illinois to Realize Their Full Potential" by M. Niederer and B. Reguly; "The Role of the Library in Gifted Child Education" by J. Van Tassel; "Providing Mediated Services for the Handicapped--A Community College Learning Resources Center Perspective" by K. Allen and G. Frazer; "Illinois Office of Education/School District Partnership--Improving School Media and Library Services" by. M. Sivak; "Unspecial Education Materials" by T. Denny; "Publishing for the Handicapped Learner" by R. Giesen; "Serving the Exceptional Child--A System Response" by K. Gray and C. Altgilbers; "National Instructional Materials Information System (NIMIS)" by C. Oldsen; "Exceptional Child Education Resources--A One-of-a-Kind Data Base" by D. Erickson; "Growth and Impact of the Association for Special Education Technology" by J. Opperman; and "National Center of Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped Program" by V. Fuchs. Also provided are a checklist on standard criteria for the selection and evaluation of instructional materials and a listing of national and Illinois agencies concerned with exceptional students. (SBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

september 1977 springfield, illinois vol.59 no.7

illinois libraries

ED149523

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Irma Bostian

Illinois Libraries

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

EC103596

media/information/services for exceptional students

alan j. dixon, secretary of state and state librarian
mrs. kathryn gesterfield, director, illinois state library
mrs. irma bostian, editor
mrs. nancy krah, assistant editor

Illinois State Library Advisory Committee

Name	Area Specialization	Term Expires
Julius R. Chitwood Rockford Public Library	Public Libraries	1977
David L. Reich, Commissioner The Chicago Public Library	Public Libraries	1979
Frederick A. Schlipf Urbana Free Public Library	Public Libraries	1978
Alice E. McKinley, Director DuPage Library System	Public Library Systems	1977
Robert McClarren North Suburban Library System	Public Library Systems	1978
James Ubel, Director Shawnee Library System	Public Library Systems	1979
Thomas M. Brown, Chairman Library — AV Department New Trier High School West	School Libraries	1977
Juanita Wallen Belleville Township High School	School Libraries	1979
Melvin R. George, Director Northeastern University Library	Academic Libraries	1979
Robert W. Oram, Associate University Librarian, University of Illinois	Academic Libraries	1977
Sister Lauretta McCusker, Dean Graduate School of Library Science Rosary College	Library Education	1978
Mary Power, Executive Secretary Health and Rehabilitative Services Division American Library Association	Institutional Libraries	1978
Joseph Benson, Director Chicago Transit Authority Library	Special Libraries	1978
Robert Lansden	Citizen-Representative	1978
Alice Ihrig	Citizen-Representative	1978
Seymour Nordenberg	Citizen-Trustee	1980
Alice Coleman	Citizen-Trustee	1978
Dorothy Vickers Shelley	Citizen-Trustee	1977
Mrs. George V. White	Citizen-Trustee	1979
Ex Officio Members		
Melvin R. George	As President of the Illinois Library Association	
James M. Furman	Board of Higher Education	
Noni C. Dodge	Citizen	

illinois libraries

VOLUME 59 NUMBER 7 ★ SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS ★ September 1977

contents

margaret niederer, special guest editor

Implications of Public Law 94-142	Gloria Calovini	468
Illinois Resource and Dissemination Network: Datamation, Dissemination, Determination	Mrs. Carol Reisinger	470
"Mainstreaming — Present Shock"	L. James Stowell and Cindy Terry	475
Media Services for Exceptional Children: Some Current Practices in Illinois	Donald C. Adcock	477
Program Development and the Gifted Area Service Centers	June B. Stark	480
Teacher Centers and P.L. 94-142: A Unique Opportunity for Cooperation and Resource Utilization	Margaret S. Estle and Cheryl R. Christensen	486
Them as Can, Does	Richard C. Ehret	489
A Program to Enable Visually Impaired Students in Illinois to Realize Their Full Potential	Margaret Niederer and Bobbie Reguly	495
The Role of the Library in Gifted Child Education	Joyce Van Tassel	498
Providing Mediated Services for the Handicapped — A Community College Learning Resources Center Perspective	Kenneth W. Allen and Gary Frazer	500
Illinois Office of Education/School District Partnership: Improving School Media and Library Services	Marie Sivak	503
Unspecial Education Materials	Terry Denny	505
Publishing for the Handicapped Learner	Richard A. Giesen	510
Serving the Exceptional Child — A System Response	Karen Gray and Cynthia Altgilbers	513
National Instructional Materials Information System (NIMIS)	Carl F. Oldsen	516
Exceptional Child Education Resources: A One-of-a-Kind Data Base	Donald K. Erickson	519
Growth and Impact of the Association for Special Education Technology	John J. Opperman	523
National Center of Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped Program	Victor E. Fuchs	525
Standard Criteria for the Selection and Evaluation of Instructional Material		531
National and Illinois Agencies Concerned with Exceptional Students		541

Illinois Libraries is published by the Illinois State Library, Springfield, Illinos 62756, and is issued monthly except in July and August. Opinions expressed in signed articles are not necessarily those of the editors or the Illinois State Library.

Cover designed by Robert Schinneer.

published by
the illinois state library
springfield, illinois 62756

second-class postage paid at springfield, illinois

(printed by authority of the state of illinois) (11M—Sept. 1977)

preface

The past ten years have seen tremendous expansions of services to handicapped and gifted individuals. This has come about largely as the result of litigation and legislation effected in order to assure the rights of exceptional students to pursue equal opportunities in as normal a manner as possible.

This impetus to normalize the environment for the handicapped and to provide specialized programs for the gifted has tremendous implication for the professions in library and media science whether in schools or public libraries. Librarians and instructional media specialists must broaden their knowledge about exceptional students and their special needs in order to meet the challenge of this new area of service. They will also have to develop innovative systems for collecting, cataloging, and retrieving information and materials for the exceptional as well as to prepare and locate adapted materials for handicapped individuals. This will require concern, compassion, and purpose on the part of the professionals involved, but, undertaken in that spirit, the library and instructional media sciences can proudly take their place at the forefront of broadened services for those individuals who previously have been denied access to such services.

To that end, this issue of *Illinois Libraries* is dedicated. The following articles provide current information on media/library systems and services for the exceptional student that should stimulate and encourage further exploration in this very important area.

Bill K. Tilley
Assistant Superintendent
Specialized Educational Services
Illinois Office of Education

Special Guest Editor's Note

As this issue goes to press, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has terminated the funding of the Area Learning Resource Center (ALRC) Project as of September 30, 1977, but is continuing efforts to provide assistance to states' materials-services for the handicapped by funding contracts for specific purposes, through RFPs (Request for Proposal).

Additionally, the NIMIS system (National Instructional Materials Information System) will be continued through the RFP process; it is anticipated that there will be a minimum of disruption of NIMIS service during this time.

The editor would like to thank all the contributors and to solicit readers' reaction to this issue.

Margaret Niederer
Special Guest Editor

implications of public law 94-142

gloria calovini
manager
materials development and dissemination section
department of specialized educational services
illinois office of education

Every profession seems to use its own particular jargon. Within the realm of education, special education has an even more unique vocabulary which is frequently interspersed with numbers or initials. These numbers and initials are variously used to identify children with particular handicapping conditions, reimbursement programs, authorizations for buildings, or other aspects of educational programming for handicapped students and generally refer to authorizing legislation or the appropriate legal citation. Today, still another initial/number combination is being voiced by educators, therapists, paraprofessionals, psychologists, and parents as well. This combination is Public Law 94-142 (P.L. 94-142) which identifies the new federal legislation designed to assure that all handicapped children will have a free appropriate public education available to them.

The first educational programs to meet the needs of the handicapped were generally established in large metropolitan centers around the country sometime around the turn of the century. Growth of special education has been erratic and directly related to legislation resulting from pressures brought to bear by parents and other interested persons. The real impetus for growth followed World War II supported by the interest and empathy of the general population. Currently an uneven pattern of service still exists ranging from mandated programs in some states to selected permissive programs in others. Students of law can readily cite recent landmark cases and opinions which have led directly to the passage of P.L. 94-142 and the assurance that all handicapped children will have a free appropriate public education available to them.

Congress estimates that there are more than eight million handicapped children in the United States today. Handicapped children are defined as mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically handicapped or other health impaired, or children with specific learning disabilities. As the new federal law is written, education must be extended by September 1, 1978, to all handicapped children in the age ranges consistent with state attendance laws. In Illinois, school districts are currently mandated to provide programs and services for handicapped children between the ages of 3 and 21.

Most legislation provides broad enabling authority with many of the details for implementation contained in the rules and regulations which are subsequently written by the appropriate department which implements the act. P.L. 94-142 is unique in this respect since the law itself is quite detailed and specific. In addition to mandating school districts to provide free public appropriate educational programs for all handicapped children, a number of the processes which assures that such programs will be provided are contained in the law. For example, all children who are potentially eligible for service, despite the severity of their handicap, must be assessed using non-discriminatory testing procedures. This safeguard is to insure that children with bilingual or bicultural differences will not be improperly diagnosed based on tests which were standardized using an entirely different segment of the population. Once located and diagnosed using a multidisciplinary staff conference process, the child is recommended for special education services and appropriate placement in the least restrictive environment. The least restrictive environment has been defined to mean that program which most closely parallels a regular or standard program. At the opposite end of the spectrum the most restrictive environment might well be defined as a residential program completely removed from a public school setting. Placement for handicapped children may be made at any step along a continuum of services ranging from regular school placement with additional supportive services for mildly impaired children to full time residential care needed by the most severely involved children.

Once placement has been determined parents

must be notified and must agree to the proposed program. If for any reason the parents wish to challenge the recommendation or object to the proposed placement, they may use a preestablished process for appealing the placement decision. If a parent or guardian of the child is not known or is unavailable or if the child is a ward of the state, a surrogate parent must be appointed to protect the rights of the child. Cases which are appealed must be heard by trained impartial hearing officers who help assure the rights of the handicapped are not violated.

Perhaps the most stringent requirements resulting from the new legislation is the necessity to develop an individualized educational program for every handicapped child for whom special education programs or services are extended. The individualized educational programs or IEPs, as they have come to be known, must include (1) a statement of the child's present level of educational performance; (2) a statement of annual goals; (3) a statement of short-term instructional objectives which are measurable and time specific; (4) a statement of specific educational services needed by the child including: (a) any adopted physical education, (b) any special instructional media and materials, (c) the estimated duration of the specialized services, and (d) assurance that the child has been placed in the least restrictive environment.

The Illinois Office of Education has called together a representative group of persons from the fields of special education libraries, media centers, psychology, and school administration to define how educators in Illinois should interpret "special instructional media and materials." Based on the recommendations of this task force special media and materials have been identified as (a) those media and materials which are unique, i.e., not typically used in regular classrooms, e.g., braille writers; (b) media and materials used because of and in reference to specific instructional objectives of the child, e.g., Language Masters.

While all of the mandates of P.L. 94-142 will be of interest and concern to most personnel of libraries and media centers, the requirements of the IEP will probably have the most impact. In Illinois alone thousands of teachers will need information, assistance, and training in writing annual goals and time specific measurable objectives. To do this effectively, teachers must be able to use assessment information and learning theory to plan programmatically. Once objectives have been drafted the appropriate media and material must be identified. The ability to complete this activity presupposes that a number of systems are in place. The teacher must know which media and material have characteristics which mesh with the educational objectives and can be used to teach the concepts effectively. Likewise, the teacher must know which materials can be used by a particular child despite his handicap. For instance, a particular material may be primarily visually oriented which frequently precludes use by blind or visually impaired children or other materials may be too small or too fragile to be used by a child with gross athetoid movements.

Materials must be available either at the building level or by means of a viable and reliable delivery system. Most importantly a new and/or renewed liaison must be developed between educators and media experts. Special teachers must be able to select and use media and materials more effectively and conversely, media experts must begin to think about children with handicaps — children whose differences require special attention.

As the implementation of P.L. 94-142 is undertaken, the need for interdisciplinary understanding and planning will become more and more apparent. We are on the threshold of an important new era in the education of handicapped students but we are also on the threshold of an exciting time for professionals to work together to enhance and enrich that educational opportunity.

illinois resource and dissemination network: datamation, dissemination, determination

mrs. carol reisinger
coordinator for the illinois resource
and dissemination network
illinois office of education
springfield, illinois

Every year thousands of school administrators and tens of thousands of teachers try to obtain methods for improving their educational systems and classrooms. Many changes are made, however, very often these educational changes occur in a haphazard fashion. Often the "improvements" that are anticipated never really develop.

Several reasons exist for the lack of program success. The first cause of program failure is that too often schools place emphasis on program change where none is needed. A systematic approach or process for identifying *real* educational needs in schools would help educators determine areas where change definitely should occur. If genuine needs are identified, then resources can be channeled to attack real educational problems, therefore ensuring a better measure of success.

Information overload or information vacuum is a second cause for failure of program change. While this appears to be a contradiction, there really is none. Two facets of the same problem exist. The issue is one of locating the exact resource of information needed for a specific problem. Educators often have little idea of how to systematically locate research or resources which they need for planning change. Thus, when they do look, they have not gone to the proper places, and they find nothing. The other facet of this problem is that educators may find such an abundance of resources that to isolate the specific research is an overwhelming task and they become discouraged before even beginning.

Often, as a result of information overload or vacuum, the closest and easiest resource is used to solve the educational problem. This resource is not always the best resource to use. A systematic approach to locating the proper information and for delivering it to the user is what is needed to aid educators in resolving the dilemma.

Program change also fails because the resources and information which have been identified have been improperly used. Often resources are developed to solve specific problems and for specific audiences. Too frequently these resources are used in ways for which they were never intended. Other times resources and information have not been linked to the educational need for which they were intended. An agent who will help to eradicate these improper uses of resources and who will facilitate suitable resource use is needed.

The three problems previously outlined are not unsolvable, and steps to eradicate them have been taken by both state and federal agencies.

One conscientious effort is being made by the National Institute for Education to assist states in improving their educational information retrieval systems and their capabilities to supply local educators with educational knowledge that they need. This assistance is in the form of special funding called the Capacity Building Grant.

The Capacity Building Project in Illinois is administered by the Illinois Office of Education and is named the *Illinois Resource and Dissemination Network (IRDN)*. The Illinois Office of Education recognizes that the State Education Agency must plan a leadership role in improving education in the state. The office of education further acknowledges that educational improvement or change cannot be accomplished in a random manner. A systematic approach to educational problem solving is essential. It is for this reason that the IOE has chosen to use the Capacity Building Project as the keystone in the structure of its plan for change.

The Illinois Office of Education perceives three major areas in which the project will function to help to produce educational change. These areas represent a direct attack on the three causes of program failure outlined at the beginning of this article. The three areas include:

Leadership/Management
Linkage
Resources

Leadership

In the area of leadership, several major priorities evolved. The first priority was to help to

establish a pattern of need on which to base collecting of resources and finding of new programs. A process was established for identifying and prioritizing school problems. Clusters of problems were identified which resulted in a "School Problems Index." Dr. Larry Werner, of the IOE staff, has worked in developing the school problems index. From this index of identified problems will come a system of change based on those needs clusters. In addition, the clusters provide a basis for putting together resources which serve as alternatives to solving the school problems. Pilot schools have undergone the process and have identified their prioritized areas of need. The IRDN staff has taken those need areas and has searched for resources which are relevant to those identified problems. The school staffs then use the searches as a basis for proceeding with programs of change. The School Problems Index will permit the IOE to identify prioritized local, regional, and statewide needs.

Another major leadership priority evolved. This priority was based on the knowledge that Local Education Agencies (LEAs) had to locate solutions to problems in numerous areas and in numerous ways. To unite Illinois Office of Education planning, resources, development, and dissemination efforts in order to better service local education agencies in their endeavors to meet educational needs of children is the second major leadership function. Based upon the identified needs, several major leadership endeavors within the agency are occurring. A consolidation of intra-agency resources and dissemination efforts has brought about increased and more efficient service to LEAs.

The Illinois Resource and Dissemination Network sets out to unite and coordinate intra-agency functions in a variety of ways. One coordinating effort is to establish linkages and guidelines for internal resource collaboration. Many resources now existing within the state agency serve unique clients while others serve a more general population. Nevertheless, all of these resource bases operate within the Illinois Office of Education framework. The resources are located in various agency sections with various methods of utilization. The IRDN staff will focus on identifying all of these agency resources, the clients served, the process for utilization, and the funding base. The method for assessing these internal resources is by using the Resource Identification Survey developed during year one of the project. The IRDN staff has been identifying and collecting information on agency resources so that they can be easily accessed by querying the IRDN. This does not mean the resources would be moved to the IRDN center, but that the IRDN would have information on where resources are housed and how they can be accessed. Another mode of intra-agency coordination is the consolidation of dissemination activities of programs administered through IOE. Dr. Nelson Ashline, Executive Deputy Superintendent of the IOE, has established a Disseminations Council. The Disseminations Council's charge is to establish dissemination policy for the agency. The implementation of the policy will insure coordinated efforts so that LEAs will receive all relevant information which emanates from the state agency. The IRDN staff will take a leadership role in establishing a plan among agency administered programs to direct resources toward areas of unmet needs.

"One growing function of the SEA is the support of research and development activities within the state. Not only do all states stimulate development of new knowledge, programs, or practices through state or federal grants, many states also have a well developed R&D function within their own agencies. This function, which focuses on the development of new programs to respond to state or locally identified needs for which there are no apparent solutions, should be coordinated closely with the dissemination system. Not only do the products of the R&D effort feed into the information component, the activities of the dissemination system help to set the agenda for R&D activities by identifying those areas or needs for which no useful information is available."[1]

The IRDN staff, after searching for resources in the prioritized need areas, or after answering a number of requests, is able to identify areas where resources are lacking. These areas are described to IOE program managers. The program managers, after working with the IRDN staff to identify specific areas of vacuum, have been able to develop a plan for attacking unmet needs in their program fields.

Linkage

"The expanding leadership and service role of the state education agency will continue to thrust it more deeply into the intricate network of interactions which influence learning within the classroom. As part of this network, the SEA is expanding its role as a primary link between local education agencies and a variety of other organizations researching and producing programs, materials,

or knowledge. It is within the context of this linking role that the SEA dissemination system seems to fit quite appropriately."[3]

The IOE, in viewing its roles, established that a linkage role does exist. With this view in mind and with the desire to provide more effective education through better service to LEAs, a major reorganization occurred. The state office was decentralized, and five teams of IOE personnel were placed in the field. These teams, called Program Service Teams (PSTs), defined their field agent scope in four broad roles. (A) Communications Linkage role identifies the field agent as the liaison between the LEA and the SEA. In this role the field agents become the advocates for the districts which they serve. Sieber writes that "Agents should be hired who reflect the educational climate or outlook in the area served."[3] Care has been taken that the PST members do reflect the ideas and concerns of their region. (B) In the Technical Assistance role, the PST member aids LEAs in technical matters such as filling out forms, obtaining legal opinions, writing proposals, and previewing proposals. (C) In the Problem Solving role, the PST member helps the LEA identify a need and aids in finding a proper solution. In order to provide this service, the PST members must be knowledgeable in problem solving techniques. A series of training programs have been provided for the PSTs to help them develop skills in the area of problem solving. (D) In the Resource Brokerage role, the PST member helps to link the proper resource to the LEA defined need. Since the PST members do not provide direct training services, it is imperative for them to be able to locate and access resources which can be identified for the LEAs. A major part of this role is locating and delivering the resources to the schools, and a second major facet of the broker role is that of helping to assess the resources.

If the SEA is to play the linkage role, it is not enough to simply "hand out" resources. Havelock says, "There must be mechanisms established which go beyond the mere dissemination of 'solutions' from R&D to practice; ways must be found to help users select, evaluate, adapt, and if necessary, wisely reject the offerings of R&D."[4] The IOE has provided through the PSTs the means to help LEAs select, evaluate, adapt, or reject resources.

Through the IRDN, training has been and continues to be provided to the PSTs. This training enhances the skills needed to perform their four functions.

Resources

The last major area under which the project functions is the area of resources. The headquarters of the resource system is located in Springfield in the IOE Media and Resources Center which serves as the agency library. Within the IRDN headquarters are housed an ERIC microfiche collection and a large collection of journals and magazines. In addition, the project has three computer terminals, two consoles and one portable, and a variety of duplicating equipment.

The staff consists of the Project Director, E. L. Grossner; the Project Manager, Carol Reisinger; a Retrieval Specialist, Rodney Barth; two Information Analyst/Searchers, Juanita Tripp and Ann Heelen; an Educational Specialist, Francis Garrick; and a secretary, Joan Rector.

These individuals are responsible in the areas of computer searching, cataloging, acquisitions, and other processing functions. The actual operation of the educational information center encompasses four system processes. "The first, acquisition, refers to the planned and continuous collection and screening of information resources, including current information about school practices from local, state, and national sources such as ERIC. The second system process pertains to technical activity which involves surrogation, such as indexing and abstracting. Dissemination, the third system process, implies providing information either on demand or on a regular schedule. Dissemination materials might include original documents, reprints, interpretive reviews, state of the art papers, referral lists, repackaged ERIC resumes, and so on. The fourth system process relates to follow-up and feedback, including maintenance of meaningful records of incidence of use, user satisfaction, facilitating use of information products, and direct and indirect service costs."[5]

These processes are addressed through the functions of the center. The acquisitions process for the IRDN consists of securing three major files. The first is a computerized data information base contracted through Lockheed Corporation. This system, called Dialog, consists of 61 data bases. One of these bases, ERIC, is used extensively for educational research and information.

A second automated data base accessed through the IRDN is the National Instructional Materials Information System (NIMIS). This computer-based retrieval system, funded through the Department of Specialized Educational Services, provides prescriptive information on a wide variety

of instructional materials that can be used in classrooms to educate handicapped children. The National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped (NCEMMH) at Ohio State University coordinates the operation of this system and is the clearinghouse for selecting materials for the file.

The third major resource file is one that is being developed through the IRDN. The Illinois Resource File consists of information about projects, products, promising practices, research, materials collections, and consultants in Illinois. There will be validated projects from other states as well.

In addition to these three main resource collections, the IRDN also maintains a special education vertical file which was developed to organize fugitive documents such as locally produced, ephemeral or monographic materials as well as association newsletters, product lists, catalogs, curriculum guides, and teaching activities and documentation about out-of-state special education programs. The special education vertical file is intended to fill the gaps between the computerized systems of the IRDN and the needs of special educators throughout the state.

Throughout the past year information on Illinois resources has been collected via the Resource Identification Survey form. This form which used the interview process is filled out and returned to the IRDN staff. The staff then indexes and abstracts the information to be filed for easy access by the searchers.

During the summer, a committee was established to develop criteria for validation of projects and programs which had not been previously validated through federally funded programs. There is little doubt that there exists in the field excellent practices and programs developed by the LEA without any state or federal aid. If these programs can be written down and taken through a validation process, all schools can benefit. Care must be taken that these programs have been validated, since only validated projects can have federal or state funds expended toward adoption of them.

While most of the information in the Illinois Resource File is on nonhuman resources, a consultant file is also established. People who are nominated for this file must fill out the Human Resources Identification Survey; they must be able to explain the service they perform and the technicalities such as time, cost, training objectives, etc. The consultants must also acknowledge that they will be evaluated. Being on the Human Resources File does not indicate IOE endorsement, only that the consultant does perform a particular service. It is the responsibility of the hiring agent to check previous clients whom the consultant has served. This information will be provided in the Illinois Human Resource File.

The indexing and abstracting function is an important one. All of the resources identified are collected and indexed in an ERIC style. Then the information is abstracted and set up in a manual file for use by searchers. The retrieval specialist developed a training program for indexing and abstracting information for placement on the Illinois Resource File. This ongoing process will enable new material to be put on the file at all times.

The technical activities of the staff also include developing the software for the system. A search negotiations form, materials duplication form, and an evaluation form for the searches and consultants have been produced.

Another major technical activity is the actual search procedure. The IRDN staff members responsible have undergone extensive training in search strategy and computer terminal use. They have gone to beginner and advanced training programs developed by Lockheed and have participated in Lockheed update programs and dissemination conferences and they have attended training sessions for NIMIS.

Dissemination activities of the staff include the development of the system to access the IRDN. The IRDN is easily accessed. The sole contact for access is the Program Service Team member who serves the geographic region in which the requestor works. No other direct access request to the system will be honored. This enables the search question to be negotiated by trained, experienced people and enables the system staff to keep more accurate records.

Only educators using the information for school use will be permitted to use the system. No higher education staff may use the system, since colleges and universities have easier access to their own data bases.

Duplication of needed information is also completed by IRDN staff. The materials are then sent to the PST members who deliver them to the LEA requestor.

The IRDN staff has developed a core of Readireference packages. These prepackaged information kits include searches, microfiche, journal articles, instructional materials searches, and other pertinent information on one specific subject. Most

of these package subjects were determined by repeated search requests or by prioritized identified needs.

Providing update information to the field by the IRDN staff is done in several ways: A bi-monthly newsletter provides information on current searches and research in a given field, plus items of interest in all aspects of the IRDN; a brochure which provides information on the IRDN services has been printed and distributed; monthly meetings of the PSTs are attended by the IRDN staff to continually update them; the IRDN staff has developed a presentation to acquaint people with the system; and a slide presentation is now being planned and developed.

The fourth process relating to follow-up and feedback includes the maintaining of records. The project secretary keeps records which provide information on search subjects, who requests them, position of requestor, how the search is to be used, when it was requested and when it was returned, the PST member who called in the search and the area of the state from where it came. In this manner the IRDN staff will be able to ascertain who is using the system and why.

In addition, the staff has developed evaluation materials in order to determine user satisfaction. It is in this way that the staff hopes to continually improve the system.

The three major components of the project — leadership, linkage, and resources — and the processes that each encompasses are insignificant ; there is no impact on education in Illinois. Simply counting the numbers of requests to evaluate the system would not help the IOE achieve its major goal of improving education. Brickley and Trohaski in their article on "The Evaluation of Information Centers," discuss five components of impact. They state "the most important component of impact consists of decisions and actions initiated by the client, increasing his effectiveness and ultimately leading to better education for targeted students."[5] The Illinois Office of Education is completely involved in the linking/nurturing process that will help LEAs work from their own agenda and will improve education for children in the state. The major means for achieving this goal will be the foundation system developed through the Illinois Resource and Dissemination Network.

STEPS FOR ACCESSING IRDN

Step 1

LEA observes a problem or need

Step 2

LEA contacts PST member to negotiate problem into search question

Step 3

PST member delivers question to IRDN staff

Step 4

IRDN staff searches Lockheed computer base and Ill. Resource File

Step 5

IRDN Staff mails alternatives to PST member

Step 6

PST member evaluates alternatives

Step 7

PST member delivers alternatives to LEA and aids in determining major resource needs

Step 8

PST writes up materials requests and returns them to IRDN

Step 9

IRDN staff duplicates needed materials and returns them to PST member

Step 10

PST member returns material to LEA and negotiates further use of resources.

[1] *Interstate Project on Dissemination, Report and Recommendations* (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, January 1, 1976) pp. 49-50.

[2] *Ibid.*, 32.

[3] Sam Sieber and others, "The Use of Educational Knowledge: Evaluation of the Pilot State Program," *Final Report, Goals, Operations and Training*, Vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, September 1972), p. 591.

[4] Ronald Havelock, "Resource Linkage in Innovative Educational Problem Solving: Ideal vs. Actual," *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, Vol. 6, 4 (Athens, Georgia, Summer 1973), p. 76.

[5] John M. Coulson, "Toward Establishing an Educational Information Dissemination Center," (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, September 1972), p. 6.

[6] Richard R. Brickley and Carolyn Trohoski, "The Evaluation of Educational Information Centers," *Report No. 34* (Washington, D.C.: NIE, December 1974), p. 11.

"mainstreaming - present shock"

I. james stoweli
assistant manager for the department of
specialized services
illinois office of education
and
cindy terry
educational specialist for the department
of specialized educational services
illinois office of education
springfield, illinois

In *Future Shock* Alvin Toffler characterized our society as the largest nomadic society in history, a nomadic society being defined as one that has the freedom to move at will. However, today there are millions of Americans whose ability to move freely in society have been limited by a governmental agency because for some reason or another, that agency has determined that these individuals do not fit societal expectations. School age children have composed a large portion of this group of controlled individuals whose freedoms and rights have been ignored for years. Benchmark federal litigation has determined that school children do not leave their rights outside the schoolhouse door.

Handicapped children have benefited and suffered at the hands of education. They have benefited from a number of fine programs developed to meet their needs: suffered from the restrictions placed on them through segregation or in some instances refusal of education to serve them.

Thomas K. Gilhool*, wrote "Stereotyping and its consequences enforced separation are repugnant to our constitutional tradition. Integration is a central constitutional value not integration that denies differences but rather, integration that accommodate difference." On May 4, 1977, the final federal regulations for the civil rights of handicapped individuals, Section 504, were published in the Federal Register. Section 504 is a part of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-112) which basically states "no otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States . . . shall solely by reasons of his handicaps be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." These regulations mirror the precepts set forth in Public Law 94-142 — The Education of All Handicapped Children Act. The passage of Public Law 94-142 in November 1975, will probably become known as having the greatest impact on education in history. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, Public Law 94-142 says, in effect, that all children must be offered the opportunity to an education. The handicapped children in the United States will finally receive the full equality of educational opportunity they deserve. The law also provides for procedural safeguards and has due process provisions which will insure that the handicapped children in the nation will be treated equally with normal children with regard to identification, placement, and educational services. The purpose of Public Law 94-142 is to assure that all handicapped children have available to them a free appropriate public education which emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs, to assure that children and parents' rights are protected, to assist states and localities, and to assure effectiveness of efforts.

When education develops a cascade of alternative environments to educate individual children according to their strengths and needs, and recog-

* Changing Public Policies: Roots and Forces," *Minnesota Education*, Volume 2, Number 2 (Spring 1976), p. 8.

nizes their rights as individuals, then they have operationally developed a process to "mainstream" handicapped children. *Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary* defines "mainstream" as: "a prevailing current or direction of activity or influence."

What impetus does this have for educators? The most obvious implication is so simple, it could easily be overlooked: "regular teachers" and "special teachers" are going to have to talk and listen and share. They are going to have to work together, to plan together in order to teach each child as an individual in a continuum of educational services.

Are we still talking about mainstream? We are — if we are talking about educating each individual child in the environment which is least restrictive to him/her, as is the intent of the previously mentioned legislation. If all teachers (as well as administrators and parents) begin to work and plan together, what will happen to the children? Utilizing your knowledge of changing behavior and educational technologies, these children will be in the "prevailing current of direction of activity or influence." Changing societal attitudes about handicapped individuals will allow our children to receive the full educational opportunities they deserve.

Mainstreaming Implications

1. Effective mainstreaming should not be confused with an effort to allow children to remain in regular classes without the additional help they need. Although such practices may be used, under the guide of mainstreaming, it violates one of the cardinal principles of education that guarantees a child the right to be educated to the fullest of his/her potential. Recently, the term individualized instruction has come to be used frequently in educational circles. It would appear that special education is and has been instruction which has been individualized to meet the unique needs of children who have demonstrated gross deficits which are physical, mental, social, and/or emotional.

2. Mainstreaming means that children will remain in regular classes to the extent to which they are able to progress and will be supported by whatever special education services are needed. The responsibility for educating the child will be shared. This implies that both regular teachers and school administrators must have a thorough understanding of the philosophy of special education and of the unique needs of students who have been identified as exceptional.

3. An intensive and ongoing in-service training program for regular teachers and school administrators is critical. It will be incumbent upon the special education community to initiate this training so that the professional personnel can work together for the benefit of those who are handicapped.

4. Mainstreaming in Illinois will mean pursuing the philosophy which it has advocated since the 1940s with even more enthusiasm and vigor. It would be totally erroneous to assume that mainstreaming indicates the end of specialized or supportive services. It does indicate the need to extend some degree of specialized training to all teachers, and certainly to provide them with an understanding of special education as it operates in this state.

5. Dissemination of information is extremely important. Apprehensive parents are being led to believe that mainstreaming will mark the end of any specialized service for their handicapped child. Cost conscious school administrators feel that mainstreaming marks the end of the necessity for providing any additional service to those who cannot profit from regular classes. Regular teachers are distressed, feeling they will have students with problems with which they will not know how to deal. And finally, some special education teachers are concerned that no work remains for them to do. These negative concepts must be changed to positive, constructive, concepts of mainstreaming.

6. Mainstreaming may be done at any level, preschool through secondary school.

7. Mainstreaming may be utilized in any type of educational setting, i.e., conventionally organized, open space, etc.

8. Special education and regular education teachers must plan together and work together for the educational benefit of each child as an individual learner.

9. Teachers and administrators need to learn about the phenomena of organizational climate. That is, the way they work together produced an environment which either facilitates growth or inhibits it. The technology for professionals to understand and control their organizational environment exists and must be incorporated in the needed changes.

Mainstream Variables

There are many variables relating to mainstreaming which need to be considered. Among

these are the following:

1. Personal needs of the handicapped child, including the educational, social, and emotional needs.
2. The nature and degree of the handicapping condition(s).
3. Attitude of regular and special education teachers toward mainstreaming.
4. Attitude of the child in the "regular" classroom toward mainstreaming.
5. Attitude of the parents of both handicapped and non-handicapped students, as well as the community at large, toward mainstreaming.
6. Attitude of school administrators including school board members, superintendents, principals, toward mainstreaming.
7. Staff qualification for teaching handicapped children, including: certification, the use of screening devices, adaptive materials, and techniques, as well as the willingness to partake in in-service training for these skills.
8. Physical facilities available.
9. Supportive services available to the "regular" teacher, e.g., special media and materials.
10. Available funding provisions.
11. Availability of trainers to instruct others in the concept of mainstreaming.
12. Curriculum offered, including the methods of teaching that curriculum.
13. Local district's organizational structure at the district and building levels.
14. Socialization or integration, i.e., physical integration of handicapped students to the mainstream of education does not necessarily mean social integration; social integration does not necessarily mean social acceptance.
15. Evaluation components to determine the efficacy of mainstreaming.
16. Multidisciplinary approach to planning and operationalizing programs for individual children.
17. Adequate instructional diagnosis.

Unfortunately, all our efforts to develop effective programs for the handicapped are doomed unless we begin to view every child as special and program accordingly. Are we ready to accept the "present shock": individualizing education and providing handicapped children the ability to move more freely in our society?

media services for exceptional children: some current practices in illinois

donald c. adcock
director of library services
school district #41
glen ellyn, illinois

The staff of school library media centers have long held that media services are an integral part of the school's program of instruction and that all students should benefit from these services. The goal of the media specialist has been to meet the individual learning and social needs of each child. However, in practice the so-called exceptional child has, for a variety of reasons, not been the recipient of these services to the degree he possibly could. One major reason is that programs for exceptional children were housed separately and often in isolation from other children attending the same school. In addition, these programs are funded in such a way that the self-contained classrooms for exceptional children accumulated the learning resources selected by the teachers as being most appropriate for their students. In many instances identical materials were purchased and housed in the media center for use by other students.

During the past few years there has been a great deal of interest in mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classrooms. With this increasing interest pressure developed to begin programs which integrated exceptional children into regular classrooms to the greatest degree possible.

Where such programs were considered, the media center was often thought to be the most logical place to begin. Many media specialists felt uncomfortable in providing services to these children, not because the children were different, but because of uncertainty as to how to determine the specific needs of these children and the appropriate materials and instructional techniques to meet these needs. In districts where mainstreaming has begun, cooperative special education teachers have worked with the media specialist to solve these problems. Help in the future can be provided

by such programs as the Special Education-Instructional Media Program offered by Illinois State University under the co-directorship of Dr. Evelyn Rex and Dr. R. E. Holdridge.

Trying to locate media programs which are offering media services to exceptional students proved difficult. Many schools are beginning to take the first tentative steps toward expanding media services to include the exceptional child. Even in those schools where actual service has begun, dual collections of materials still exist. The problems of integrating the materials now housed in special education classrooms with those in the media center are reminiscent of those in consolidating classroom libraries into one central collection of materials. Media center staffs are currently making the resources of the center available to the exceptional students and their teachers in hopes that the benefits of a centralized core collection of materials will become obvious. The impetus of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142) could hasten this process.

It is hoped that the programs of the three schools outlined below will be of assistance to those who are now beginning to offer media services to exceptional children. In addition, the recent publication, *The Special Child in the Library*[1] should serve as a good resource for planning services to the exceptional child.

Whitney M. Young High School, Chicago

Hearing impaired users of the library media center at Whitney M. Young Magnet High School became "student-teachers" as the media center staff began to learn sign language in order to communicate directly with these students. The staff has been learning sign language for about a year and a half with particular emphasis on signs that coincided with library media center jargon and have found their students helpful as additional instructors.

The hearing impaired students which are only a part of the total student body are introduced to the library media center through an orientation session with an interpreter working closely with the students. After the orientation, these students may come to the center individually on a pass or may come as a classroom group accompanied by a teacher.

The need for continuous practice and use of sign language in order to communicate effectively with these students is only one area of concern in providing services to these students. Another area is locating and choosing a wide variety of high interest-low vocabulary reading materials. In addition to books, audiovisual materials are supplied. Additional resources are located in the classroom.

In order to effectively mainstream the 271 students in this program, two paraprofessionals work in the media center during various periods throughout the day. One, an interpreter in the hearing impaired department, assists hearing impaired students when they come to the center for materials. The other works in the center two periods daily and is responsible for all audiovisual equipment loaned to the hearing impaired department.

Hearing impaired students are involved in special activities held in the center. During National Art Week, several of these students operated a portrait gallery in the center where they sketched members of the student body.

Churchill School, Glen Ellyn District #41

Churchill School houses five special education classrooms. They include a primary and an intermediate educable mentally handicapped classroom, two rooms for orthopedically handicapped, and one room for students with learning disabilities. Many of these students have been mainstreamed in regular classrooms at the appropriate level. Uses of the media center are as varied as the needs created by the variety of disabilities which affect the learning of these children. Resources found in the media center are used in the special education classroom and in the center. Some materials taken from the center must be modified for use by these students while others are used without modification. For example, many educational games can be used effectively by simplifying the rules for these students.

Students in the intermediate EMH class come to the center as a group once a week to choose books. The teachers assist each child in selecting two books, one he wishes to read and one he would like to have read to him. Some children from this group use additional books for reports. When ready these students are involved in the library skills instruction. This instruction has been moderately successful, and the students can make limited use of the card catalog. Skill development materials at the appropriate level are used by these students in their classroom or in the center in the

[1] Barbara Holland Baskin and Karen H. Harris, editors, *The Special Child in the Library*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1976.

same manner as the students from regular classrooms. The media center staff assists the teacher in locating materials in the areas of social studies and science. The teacher excludes those materials which are not appropriate and often rewrites scripts to replace the audio portion of sound filmstrips.

Wide spaces between shelves and tables allow the orthopedically handicapped students to move about the center with relative ease. These children who often can not write and have difficulty speaking find programmed learning machines easy to use. Their ability to make responses on these machines with limited physical exertion make them highly motivating learning devices. Once they have been physically adjusted to a work area, these students can work independently. The teacher of this group welcomes the center as a place to provide variety outside the classroom, and each child visits the center once a day with the teacher or the aide.

Learning disability students make the most extensive use of the center and its resources. Many of the skill development materials in a variety of levels of difficulty and mediums found in the center are appropriate for use with these students. They come to use the center independently and with groups of students from their classroom or the classroom into which they have been mainstreamed.

The teachers of all these students find the center is a valuable resource to them as they make use of professional materials and references for help in social studies and science. They and their students find the center is a welcoming place with inviting experiences for all. Going to the center with other children makes the exceptional child feel a part of the whole school and helps with their social development and acceptance by other students.

Vandenberg School, Dalton District #109

Vandenberg School in Dalton has combined the staff of the learning abilities and learning center programs to work with students who have specific learning disabilities and those who have developmental disabilities. The combined programs operating under the name of Vandenberg Skills Center attempts to respond to children's learning needs and problems through observation, testing, diagnosing, and prescribing. In addition to working with students, the skills center staff maintains close contact with teachers and staff to keep them aware of the wide range of new and existing materials and programs.

The combined program deals primarily with skills development, and the resources of the two programs were combined to be used as resources for the new program. The skills center staff uses a goal sheet for each student to record materials or programs to be used as well as completion dates and a simple student self-evaluation section on work habits. In addition, each teacher is provided a bimonthly update assessment of each student's progress. The skills center also maintains a cumulative record of the programs and materials used by each student in the center.

The schools cited provide examples of how media centers working with special education teachers can meet the needs of the exceptional child. All of the programs are different as are the programs for children in regular classrooms. Those schools beginning to develop programs to mainstream the exceptional student into the media program must design programs which will meet the needs of these children just as they designed a program to meet the needs of those students they are currently serving.

The author expresses his appreciation to Cora Bradof, Churchill School; Sally Lazendorf and Shirley Stafford, Vandenberg School; and Sandra McKinly, Whitney M. Young Magnet High School who supplied information concerning programs in their schools.

program development and the gifted area service centers

june b. stark
consultant in gifted child education
charleston, illinois

To define an Illinois gifted area service center is something like trying to describe the proverbial elephant — it all depends on where you are standing while you are looking at it. However, whether you are a district superintendent concerned about program logistics and funding, or a first grade teacher facing each day a child who already knows everything the curriculum guides say you (and the second grade teacher as well!) are supposed to be teaching him, or a former classroom teacher now working as a staff member of one of Illinois' nine gifted area service centers, there is universal agreement on one point — the name of the area centers' game *is service.*

The Illinois Gifted Program, Department for Exceptional Children, Illinois Office of Education, under whose umbrella the area service centers operate, is a non-mandated program, funded annually, which provides some money to each school district in the state that submits a proposal for providing special services to an identified group of gifted children.

Simply to develop a plan is no easy task. To implement the proposed program is even harder. In order to help schools in both those areas, the gifted program has carved the state into nine areas, and in each of those areas there is a service center staffed by former classroom practitioners who are charged with providing a variety of services to districts, teachers, parents, and gifted children.

Originally the gifted program came into existence in 1964 because a small group of educators, dedicated to providing better education for youngsters too often ignored in classrooms, were able to get the Illinois legislature to provide monies to encourage school districts to develop special programs. Since the money given to the school districts by the gifted program, a very small amount which is approximately two dollars per total average daily attendance, is to be used for developing a program for identified gifted children, one of the first calls for help to a service center by a district is likely to be, "How *do* I identify a gifted student "

The facetious response might be, "With care!" or "For what purpose?" Neither rejoinder is as flippant as it first seems since identification is not an end in itself. Identification serves a purpose only if something substantially different, some *program* for *gifted* children is available once the identification is completed.

There are parameters outlined by the Rules and Regulations[1] which do provide a general idea of where and how to begin. In the first place, the Illinois program, as well as the United States Office of Education, recognizes not one but six areas of giftedness: general intellectual; specific academic, creative thinking; visual and performing arts, creative thinking; psychomotor; and leadership. Through this recognition of various types of gifts, the gifted program allows the districts to select the area in which they wish to develop programs. Thus Chicago may identify students for programs in all six areas, while a very small district may concentrate on developing a program for students who show exceptional talent in one academic area, such as math or science. It is, in every case, a district choice.

The service centers, therefore, when helping with the problem of identification, will conduct workshops for an entire district, or work with a gifted committee, or, in many cases, with an individual teacher, to help decide which identification procedures best suit the program which is being planned.

The Rules and Regulations require that three separate identification procedures be used for identification in each category of giftedness. The procedures most commonly used include I.Q. tests, achievement tests, creativity tests, teacher recommendations, past school performance, and teacher, parent, or peer checklists.

If the district is concentrating on the general intellectual area of giftedness, the state rules require that one of the means of identification be

[1] "Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Gifted Education Reimbursement Programs," Department for Exceptional Children, Illinois Office of Education.

an I.Q. test. With that exception, the schools may select which three means of identification, when combined, will provide the best basis for selection of students for the program they have in mind. As is always the case, the function of the service center staffs is to *help*, not dictate to, the district personnel in developing their specific gifted programs.

Frequently the administrators and teachers in a school system are acutely aware of the need to have a program for their gifted students. Sometimes, however, they do not have any sense of direction as to what kind of program they want to develop. Or they may know very specifically that they want to develop a program in language arts enrichment at the junior high school, but they are perplexed as to how a program can operate when they don't have the money to hire an extra teacher or the space to have a separate classroom.

In order to help answer these kinds of concerns the service centers may act as a linkage agent, which is one of their major functions. Because they are aware of what schools are doing with gifted programming, they can make suggestions as to visitation sites, and teachers can go and see how other teachers are working with gifted children, what kinds of materials are being used, and they can ask the pragmatic questions that they want — and need — the answers to. Often the very best help comes from such teachers and administrators who have faced the problems themselves. After such visitations, it is easier to make decisions as to how to proceed with program development. (Traditionally the gifted program has staffed their centers from the ranks of these classroom teachers, which has meant that their help has generally been better received than that of other outside consultants who are sometimes perceived as being too far removed from the realities of the classroom.)

Often the service centers have informal arrangements with their client districts to allow teachers to go to other schools to provide on-the-spot help to a teacher who is trying to get her program developed. These teachers, too, are asked to conduct in-service sessions, either alone or working with the staff of a service center.

Undoubtedly one of the most valuable functions a service center performs is to connect those who want to know with those who have, at least in part, the answers. However, once teachers decide what kind of program they want to begin, there are still problems, and one of the biggest problems is teacher training. A teacher wants to do something significantly different with creatively gifted children. What exactly can she do? Or she realizes that she wants to develop the higher level thinking skills of students of high intellectual ability, but she doesn't understand what kinds of questions to ask to get students to synthesize and generalize. Or she may be convinced that schools have done very little in nurturing the natural leadership talents of students, and she may want to work in that area but be at a loss as to how to begin.

Here again the service centers have help to offer such teachers. As a matter of fact, teacher training has always been at the very heart of the gifted program, because those who originally founded the program philosophically were convinced that if anything significantly better for gifted children happened in a classroom, it had to begin with the teacher. The teacher establishes the climate in his classroom. He models acceptance or rejection of the exceptional children he teaches. He encourages or discourages an open, inquiring mind. He opens up the limitless potential for learning, or he restricts a gifted child to the prison of a textbook assignment.

The teacher training offered by service centers varies from the general to the very specific, and from a one session workshop to semester-long courses for which college credit is offered. For example, a center might offer a one or two-day workshop on creativity, concentrating on the skills of fluency, flexibility, originality, and elaboration. On the other hand, more intensive training in creativity might focus on working out creativity lesson plans, complete with objectives and procedures for evaluation in one specific content area. Most service centers have established arrangements with a college or university, and it is possible for teachers to enroll for graduate credit courses in gifted child education.

The most ineffective training which centers are asked to give is the awareness level workshop, perhaps after school or on an institute day. Such training is too brief to be of much value, and any worth that it does have is in simply making teachers "aware" that they need to seek out further training.

Training offered by service centers might typically include such topics as identificaton, creativity, individualized instruction, systematic program development, inquiry questioning techniques, values clarification, leadership training, individual learning styles, and gifted education as it relates to academic content areas. Workshops are staffed

by the service center personnel, by classroom teachers, or by outside consultants hired for their specialized competencies.

Finally, without doubt the most effective of all the types of training offered by the gifted program service centers has been their summer institutes. These institutes have ranged from two to six weeks and have varied from spending the entire time working in one area of concentration to teachers working out their own schedules from many alternatives. The institutes have brought in nationally known outside speakers. They have provided time for in depth research and learning. They have allowed teachers to get to know teachers from other districts who are also concerned about gifted children, and they have established a camaraderie that has formed an almost tangible network of friendship among "gifted teachers" throughout the state. Perhaps one of the most valuable outcomes of institutes is people getting to know people, and, in a relaxed atmosphere, findng that not only are they teaching students with gifts and talents, but they also have much untapped potential which can surface in a supportive learning environment. The institutes attempt to model for the teachers the type of learning situation which the staff of the gifted program feels is usually the most productive for gifted students.

Unfortunately, because of cutbacks in funding by the legislature, there has been a decrease in the number and the duration of summer institutes. All evaluation reports of the gifted program and the effectiveness of the service centers — and there have been many such evaluations — have concluded invariably that the summer institutes are the most valuable training available to teachers in gifted child education. A number one priority with those people working with the legislature for the restoration of funds is for money to fund summer institute training.

In addition to gifted centers providing services in identification, in linking people, and in teacher training, the service center staff, when requested, makes classroom visits and does demonstration teaching. For example, they may show a teacher how to help a student plan and begin an independent learning project. They may demonstrate a questioning sequence that encourages higher level thinking skills. Or they may help the teacher incorporate into her classroom some of the special materials for gifted students purchased through the reimbursement money made available by the state to the local system. Or, yet again, the service center staff member may spend considerable time with a teacher in classroom reorganization in order to help the teacher individualize instruction, thus freeing the gifted students from the lock-step-everybody-gets-the-same-assignment that often makes the brightest students the greatest underachievers, when learning is compared to the potential for learning.

A service most appreciated by the classroom teachers which is provided by many of the service centers relates to their functioning as "teacher centers." While the least tangible, probably the most important aspect of such a function is the providing of emotional support to teachers who feel lonely and uncertain as they attempt to do something new for the gifted students in their classroom. They may represent a threat to their fellow staff members who prefer to do things the way they have always done them. They may not even be receiving support from their principal or central administration, if those people are less aware of how badly the gifted children are short-changed by the standard curriculum. The service centers then become a place where the teachers can come, have a cup of coffee, and find a sympathetic ear. The center also becomes a place where flagging enthusiasms can be revived, where a teacher can get reactions as to why something hasn't worked out as it was planned, and perhaps suggestions as to where and how to start over tomorrow.

In addition to the intangible support offered by the service centers, there are more concrete aids to teachers in the form of some student materials which are known to be effective with gifted students. There are also materials where teachers can make things for their classrooms, perhaps a game to help students reinforce or learn a particular concept, or activity cards which will direct his independent exploration of a topic that interests him. Some of the centers offer "make-it-and-take-it" workshops for teachers for the purpose of adding to the curriculum materials available in their classrooms. Such informal workshops encourage the sharing among educational practitioners interested in the gifted.

All the service centers are similar to teacher centers in yet another way in that they have libraries and resource materials relating to gifted that, unfortunately, surpass what is available in many university libraries. These materials are available for teachers to check out or use at the center. Some of the books provide solid background in the

theories of gifted child education. Others may be specific "this is how to do it" books, and still others may challenge the teachers to examine their own attitudes and teaching practices in the classroom.

Most gifted service centers have newsletters which are sent to large numbers of teachers and administrators in their client districts and throughout the state. However, with the rise in postage rates and the cuts in funding, the newsletters are increasingly difficult for the centers to support. They keep teachers informed as to what workshops are available to them, of developments on the state level, and of what is happening in gifted education generally throughout the nation. They also usually include very practical suggestions for classroom teachers, which are greatly appreciated. Evaluation has shown that the newsletters are considered one of the popular services provided by the centers, and if eliminated because of cost there is no doubt that the communication from the centers to the field will be greatly reduced.

Planning and conducting the annual State Gifted Conference for 1,500 or so people represents a large investment of time and energy on the part of one or more of the gifted service centers. The conference is anticipated eagerly by the educators, mostly classroom teachers, who attend. They hear outstanding speakers in gifted education and attend small group in-service sessions on an extremely wide variety of topics relating to giftedness, all emphasizing a practical, realistic educational approach. Part of each district's local reimbursement budget, the gifted program development money given by the state to districts, can be spent on expenses incurred in any in-service training provided by the gifted service centers. Therefore, the expense of the State Gifted Conference is covered by the local gifted budget.

The service centers are beginning to work more than they have in the past in helping to organize parent groups, which, if properly organized, can effect needed changes in local curriculum and programs. There is, however, a great need for much more work to be done with parents of gifted children. The fact that while service to gifted children is the primary concern of all the centers, that service must be provided *indirectly* by working through the school administration and the classroom teacher is difficult to communicate to parents of gifted children, who might prefer a staff member to work one-on-one with their child. Service centers, however, have no supervisory or monitoring clout. They must be invited into the classroom and work through persuasion and education, not coercion. They cannot dictate to a local district or a teacher that they *must* do something with a certain child, even if the parents would like for them to do just that. Those facts are sometimes difficult to communicate to a parent of a gifted child who is unhappy with his child's education and contacts the service center for help. There is, overall, a great need for more work to be done in organizing, educating, and working cooperatively with parent groups.

Regardless of the specific activity of the service centers, whether working with administrators, teachers, parents, or the general public, they are always trying to destroy the myths that are too commonly held about gifted children.

For example:

Myth: Gifted students are easily identified — they make straight A's.

Fact: Gifted students may be challenged so little by what is offered to them by a standard curriculum that they mentally, if not physically, drop out of the classroom. The straight A student *may* be gifted. But he may also simply have learned to play the school game.

Myth: Schools don't need to do anything different for gifted students. They'll make it anyway.

Fact: Gifted students may "make it." On the other hand, the restless, cynical, disenchanted masses of non-contributing young people who wander about aimlessly frequently were the brightest, most gifted youngsters in their classes. They were special students whose needs were not met, often not even recognized. Gifted students have a right to equal educational opportunities, but in terms of what they are capable of learning, such opportunities are denied them. Educators have been much more willing to accept that the mentally handicapped exceptional students must have special services and special materials than they have been to accept that same need for the gifted exceptional child.

Myth: You can give gifted students "enrichment" by giving them more of what everybody else is doing.

Fact: Working fifty math problems instead of twenty is *not* enrichment. And any student who is gifted soon learns to mask his ability in order to avoid the penalty that such enrichment actually is.

Myth: I.Q. test identify the gifted.

Fact: I.Q. tests only aid in identifying some of the gifted students. The more tools of identification

that are combined, the more accurate the identification process. I.Q. tests are obviously more reliable indicators of general intelligence and specific academic aptitude than they are of the creativity gifted or those gifted in visual and performing arts.

Myth: A school cannot have a gifted program unless gifted students can be taught in a separate classroom.

Fact: While there is a very real disagreement as to whether gifted students can be best educated in a homogeneous or a heterogeneous classroom, the reality is that most gifted children *are* in heterogeneous classes. And meeting the special needs of gifted children can be done in those classrooms — *if* the teacher is teaching to individual needs of students. That is not easy, but many teachers are doing it successfully.

It is often easy to concentrate on reimbursement or program guidelines, definitions, rules and regulations, and departmental organization charts and forget that the purpose of an educational program begins and ends with students.

A small group of people passionately dedicated to the needs of gifted children were able in the early 1960s to get the Illinois legislature to fund the gifted program to encourage school districts to give more attention to these children, who were frequently ignored because of mistaken myths about giftedness. These foresighted people, themselves gifted educators, were aided in their task by the fact that the Russian Sputnik had encouraged a critical reappraisal of what was happening in schools. The educational pendulum since then has swung back and forth several times, from programmed instruction to independent study, from open education to back-to-basics.

But the primary concern of people working in gifted education is still the same — a concern for that child who represents the greatest resource our nation has, the child who will be able to identify and solve the problems on which the survival of civilization depends, the student who, in terms of his potential, is denied his right to equal educational opportunity.

While the service centers may work through district administrators and classroom teachers, their reason for being is those children, and those children alone.

Area Service Centers for the Gifted
1976-77

Area Service Center Staff	Fiscal Agent
Chicago Area Service Center Richard W. Ronvik, Director Robert Todd, Staff Assistant, Area A Thaddeus Lenart, Staff Assistant, Area B Yossel Naiman, Staff Assistant, Area C Mrs. Helen Lundahl, Secretary 228 North LaSalle Street, Room 1114 Chicago, Illinois 60601 (312) 641-4587	Dr. McNair Grant Associate Superintendent Government Funded Programs 228 North LaSalle Street Chicago, Illinois 60601 (312) 641-4577
Area Service Center for Educators of Gifted Children Roger Taylor, Director Beverly J. Milam, Consultant Joe Wayman Lorie Nicolai, Secretary Governors State University Park Forest South, Illinois 60466 (312) 534-5000, Ext. 2470 or 2460	Dr. Roy Cogdell, Dean College of Human Learning and Development Governors State University Park Forest South, Illinois 60466 (312) 534-5000, Ext. 2355
Region III Area Service Center for Educators of Gifted and Talented Youth Charles Alkire, Director Robert Davis, Consultant Mrs. Kathy L. Davis, Consultant Illinois Central College Box 2400 East Peoria, Illinois 61635 (309) 694-4366	Dr. Leon Perley, President Illinois Central College East Peoria, Illinois 61635 (309) 694-5432

McKendree College Area Service Center
Raymond Grinter, Director
Tom Burk, Consultant
Carolyn Corstange, Secretary
Lebanon, Illinois 62254
(618) 537-4477

Dr. Julian Murphy, President
McKendree College
Lebanon, Illinois 62254
(618) 537-4481

Service Center for Educators
of Gifted and Talented Youth
Linda J. Finfrock, Director
Leo Baudino, Consultant
Mary M. Dunning, Consultant
Marie Broadrick, Secretary
805 West Pennsylvania, 3rd Floor
Urbana, Illinois 61801
(217) 344-2384

Dr. Kermit Harden, Superintendent
Urbana Community School
District #116
1201 South Vine Street
Urbana, Illinois 61801
(217) 384-3636

John A. Logan Area Service Center
John R. Ferrell, Director
Glenn Poshard, Consultant
Mrs. Milanne Davis, Secretary
John A. Logan College, R.F.D. #2
Carterville, Illinois 62918
(618) 985-3741, Ext. 371 or 372

Dr. Robert Tarvin, President
John A. Logan College
R.F.D. #2
Carterville, Illinois 62918
(618) 985-3741, Ext. 358

Region IV Area Service Center
for Gifted and Talented Students
Nancy Johnson, Director
Gayle Tronvig, Consultant
Lois I. Whitaker, Secretary
700 Main Street
Carthage, Illinois 62321
(217) 357-2264

The Honorable R. Dale Heagy
Administrative Officer
Hancock County Materials Coop.
Superintendent
Hancock County Educational Service
Region, Courthouse
Carthage, Illinois 62321
(217) 357-3185

Northern Illinois University Area
Service Center
Dr. Barbara Gay Ford, Director
Pamela F. Miller, Staff Assistant
Karen Stoyanoff, Staff Assistant
Northern Illinois University
Department of Special Education
DeKalb, Illinois 60115
(815) 753-0658

Roy E. France, Controller
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115
(815) 753-1588

Region I—North Area Service Center
Sandra Schmulbach, Director
Lorraine Plum, Consultant
Sue Putignano, Secretary
Elgin Unit District #46
4 South Gifford Street
Elgin, Illinois 60120
(312) 888-5335 or 888-5334

Dr. Paul Lawrence, Superintendent
Elgin Unit District #46
4 South Gifford Street
Elgin, Illinois 60120
(312) 741-6800, Ext. 267

Joyce Van Tassell, Coordinator
Gifted Children Program
Illinois Office of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

Jay R. Stortzum, Assistant Coordinator
Gifted Children Program
Illinois Office of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

teacher centers and p.l. 94-142: a unique opportunity for cooperation and resource utilization

margaret s. estle
teacher
northbrook district #27
and
cherly r. christensen
teacher center/in-service coordinator
glenview district #34

The teacher center is one of the hottest educational concepts on the scene today. Generally it takes over twenty years for an innovation to work its way into the mainstream of American education. However, in less than half a decade, the teacher center has become a well-known locus for new approaches to educational personnel development.[1] The recognized successes of the British centers have given impetus to the development of American centers.

The teacher center concept is a multidimensional construct for which there is no one definition but only emphases and preferences. Definitions of various teacher centers may be stated as follows:

1. A meeting place for at least two people concerned with learning.
2. A demonstration of the intimate connection between teacher development and teacher education or in-service training.
3. A locale where theory and practice are integrated thereby making the two a single viable component of professional preparation and renewal.[2]
4. A vehicle which provides a means for coordinating the shared attempts of higher education, local school districts and practicing teachers to prepare prospective teachers and to renew professional skills of practicing teachers.
5. A means for strengthening the relationship between the university and the classroom and a means for making the relationship more relevant.
6. A physical facility within a school where teachers can meet on a voluntary basis to share ideas related to their professional and personal lives. It is clearly one of the first efforts in this country to encourage teachers to develop, through participation, a community of learning and sharing within the schools.[3]
7. A place where the basic goal is the promotion of changes in the attitudes and behaviors of educational personnel (not just teachers) resulting in improved learning for children.[4]
8. Local physical facilities and self-improvement programs organized and run by the teachers themselves for purposes of upgrading educational performance. The primary function is to make possible a review of existing curricula and other educational practices by groups of teachers and to encourage teacher attempts to bring about changes.[5]
9. Allen A. Schmieder[6] defines a teacher center as "a place, in situ or in changing locations, which develops programs for the training and improvement of educational personnel (in-service teachers, preservice teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, college teachers, etc.) in which the participating personnel have an opportunity to share successes, to utilize a wide range of educational resources and to receive training specifically related to their most pressing teaching problems."

A rationale for teachers centers can be stated:

1. Fundamental educational reform will come only through those charged with the basic educational policy and the teachers.
2. Teachers are not likely to change their ways of doing things just because they are told to do so.
3. Teachers will take reform seriously only when they are responsible for defining their own educational problems, delineating their own needs, and receiving help on their own terms and at their own locations.

Essentially, the teacher center movement "put the monkey of educational reform on the teachers" own backs. And they love it!

It is estimated in a sampling conducted by the Syracuse Teacher Center Project[7] that there may

be as many as 4,500 sites which see themselves as being associated with the teacher center movement in some manner. In another study by Emmitt Smith[8] of the Texas Teacher Center Program, it was determined that eighteen states have legislative or administrative provisions which relate to the establishing and/or supporting of teacher centers. It is a reasonable assumption that the movement is one of the most significant in current educational reform.

One of the trends in teacher centers is the building of training complexes which are jointly organized public schools, colleges, universities, community organizations, and public agencies and which bring their resources together in a system which provides a place for university personnel, teachers in training, community members, and technologists to meet and to determine activities in a collegial manner. Here the centers are free to employ a variety of training models which no single system can presently effect and which are responsive to and responsible for the individual needs of the cooperating systems.

The educational needs of the nation have changed markedly and dramatically and it is not possible for any single institution to be responsible for the training of teachers. The teacher center movement may be the forerunner of new institutional forms for a new kind of teacher training. The urgent need, at this point in time, is clinical training for teachers which can bridge the gap between theory and practice. It is suggested that this can be accomplished through a sharing of mutual goals and through cooperative efforts and more efficient use of human and fiscal resources by establishing a relationship of educators at the state, university, and local school district levels. This coordinated effort would make better use of the specific expertise available at each level. Coordination, of course, will also be needed to fulfill the proposed regulations for P.L. 94-142, specifically in the sections relating to a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development. These sections require that each state provide:

1. In-service training of general and special educational, instructional, related services, and support personnel;
2. Procedures to insure that all personnel necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act are appropriately and adequately prepared and trained, and that activities sufficient to carry out this personnel development plan are scheduled; and
3. Effective procedures for acquiring and disseminating to teachers and administrators of programs for handicapped children significant information derived from educational research, demonstration and similar projects, and for adopting, where appropriate, promising educational practices and materials developed through those projects.[9]

(The proposed regulations' definition of "in-service training" means any training other than that received by an individual in a full-time program which leads to a degree.)

Local teacher centers could be a very effective link between the classroom teacher and federal and state facilities such as A.L.R.C., REMIS, and the newly proposed PDC (Professional Development Center) centers, state and university personnel, as well as a place to spotlight "local resources" such as special education teachers already within the districts.

For example, Glenview's Teacher Operated Center (TOC), which is beginning its fifth year of operation has offered several workshops and courses relating to the "special" student and the classroom teacher. On several occasions, the district's Learning Development teachers met with interested classroom teachers to share information and materials appropriate for the L.D. student and how these materials could be adopted for classroom use.

District social workers have offered a series of two-hour sessions dealing with divorce, illness, separation and death, and the implications of these crises for the classroom teacher.

In addition, several credit courses through a local university have been offered at the TOC relating to Cooperative Grouping, which also has implications for "mainstreaming" students.[10]

We have found success in viewing the teacher center as an inclusive, rather than exclusive, process and place, i.e., each person has something to give or get regardless of title or role in the district and/or community. This ,too, is in the spirit of P.L. 94-142 — that "special" students have unique needs, but can also contribute to "regular" classrooms.

As noted earlier, the label "teacher center" has many definitions. In Illinois, there are teacher centers staffed and supported by universities (Teacher Center Project, SIU), private foundations (The Teacher Center, Wilmette; Teachers Curriculum Work Center, Hyde Park; Educational Resource Center, Chicago), county and private funds (Maine

Township Teacher Learning Center, Des Plaines), and those within and supported by local districts (District #21 — Renewal Center; #25 — Arlington Heights Teacher Center; #34 — Teacher Operated Center; #59 — The Teacher Reacher).

In spite of the diverse pattern of funding and staffing of teacher centers in Illinois, a commonality is that they are all involved in offering workshops for teachers and emphasize "concreteness and connection," especially relating to curriculum materials, . . . "inventing or adapting curriculum materials with teachers, and helping teachers make use of the potent learning experiences in nature, homes, and communities. In the teachers' centers' perspective, the curriculum development task is never ending and must be teacher-involving, especially where there are schools operating under social mandates for desegregation, mainstreaming mentally retarded into regular classrooms, or other forms of mixed-ability grouping."[11]

Because of other new legislation, P.L. #94-482, Part B., there will be funding available in 1978 for local districts to establish teacher centers in cooperation with institutions of higher education. Although the final regulations relating to this Act are not available at the time of this writing, the proposed regulations reflect some elements of successful teacher centers.[12]

Rand investigators Berman and McLaughlin also found many of these key elements in successful federal projects. Some of the elements in successful change projects were:

1. Teachers were supported, not made to feel defensive, and were viewed as collaborators, not "targets."
2. Emphasized local inventions rather than implementation of "validated products."
3. Highly committed, energetic local leaders were involved, rather than outside experts.
4. A sufficient number of participants to make an impact on a school district and gain momentum, or what they describe as "critical mass."[13]

Considering these findings and our personal experience, it is the authors' feeling that the teacher center model provides an appropriate, effective process for professional growth and educational change — whether it be responding to the need for training or retraining large numbers of teachers to fulfill the requirements of P.L. 94-142 or the need of one teacher to develop alternative materials to teach place value.

For readers who would like more information about teacher centers, the following publications are available from The Teachers' Center Exchange, Far West Laboratories for Educational Research and Development, 1855 Folsom Street, San Francisco, California 94103: *Exploring Teachers' Centers,* ($6.00); *Essays on Teachers' Centers,* ($6.00); and the Teachers' Center Exchange Directory ($6.50).

---

[1] Allen A. Schmeider and Sam J. Yarger, *Teacher Centers: Toward the State of the Scene,* American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C., ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C., University of South Florida, Tampa Leadership Training Institution for Educational Personnel Development. 1974.

[2] *The Co-operative Teacher Center,* (A concept paper) The Illinois Office of Education, p. 1.

[3] William Fibkins, "The Whys and Hows of Teachers' Centers," *Phi Delta Kappan,* vol. 55, no. 8 (April 1974), p. 467.

[4] Alan Markowitz and Frances Halley, *The Advisory and Learning Exchange, The Sharing of Knowledge and Concerns.* Profiles of Promise 14, National Institute of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C., ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies and Social Science Education, Boulder, Colorado; Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., Boulder, Colorado. 1973. (ED 095 071)

[5] Stephen K. Bailey, "Teachers' Centers: A British First," *Phi Delta Kappan,* vol. 53, no. 3 (November 1971), p. 146.

[6] Schmieder, p. 6.

[7] Sam J. Yarger and Albert Leonard, "A Descriptive and Analytical Study of the Teaching Center Movement in American Education." School of Education, Syracuse University, sponsored by the National Teacher Corps and the Office of Career Education of the United States Office of Education. May 1, 1974.

[8] Emmitt D. Smith, "The State of the States in Teacher Centering," *The Journal of Teacher Education,* vol. 25, no. 1, (Spring 1974), p. 21-25.

[9] Federal Register, Department of HEW, Office of Education, December 30, 1976, Part IV.

[10] D. W. Johnson & R. T. Johnson, *Learning Together & Alone — Cooperation, Competition & Individualization,* Prentice Hill, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, p. 92.

[11] K. Devany, "Surveying Teachers' Centers" (Teachers' Centers Exchange Occasional Paper #1) April 1977, p. 4.

[12] Federal Register, Department of HEW, Office of Education, November 22, 1976, Part V.

[13] P. Berman and M. W. McLaughlin, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. IV., The Findings in Review,* R-1589/4-HEW (Santa Monica, Calif. Rand Cooperative, April 1975).

them as can, does

richard c. ehret
remiscoordinator for the northwestern
illinois association

REMIS — pronounced like one of the founders of ROME is, in point of fact, an acronym for (I promise to do this to you only once) the Regional Educational Media and Information Service.

I'm sure that outside of special education circles in Illinois the name and the organization it stands for mean nothing. Perhaps there are even some people here within special education who are not familiar with the name either. This is to be expected. REMIS is a comparatively new program within Illinois. It is my intention in this article to focus on this particular program and describe what I consider a unique media system and one I believe could have significant impact on the media needs of special education in Illinois. I realize that there are probably similar claims being made by just about every other author in this issue for his particular organization or program. Who knows? Some of us may be justified in our claims. You'll have to read on to find out.

The reader should be warned that my argument is cumulative. For him to seek comprehension, it will be necessary to start at the very beginning.

A Short History of REMIS

REMIS began functioning in the fall of 1974. A REMIS Unit was established within each Regional Project (in Illinois there are thirteen Special Education Regional Projects which provide diagnostic and educational services to handicapped children in cooperation with the local school districts and special education directors).

In the beginning the REMIS Units' staff consisted solely of a REMIS coordinator. Each coordinator was provided with a budget through the Regional Project and given five areas of responsibility by the Illinois Office of Education. These areas include: Information Retrieval and Dissemination, Materials Accessibility, Curriculum Development, In-service Programming, Materials Development and Public Awareness. The thirteen REMIS programs began work under the direction of the A.L.R.C. (Area Learning Resource Center) #7 staff.

As time passed, each REMIS Unit, while functioning within its five areas of responsibility and meeting on a regularly monthly basis with the A.L.R.C. staff, began to take on the characteristics of the Regional Project to which it was attached. This was quite natural but proved to be a mixed blessing. Strong regional projects tended to have strong REMIS Units. Like any organic material, the growth and development of individual REMIS programs tended to reflect the soil into which they had been placed. Without committment and belief to sustain them at the local level, some REMIS Units faltered.

Every new program's inception is accompanied by confusion and a certain degree of chaos. This state can be very frightening for some. For others there is a sense of excitement and creativity inherent in this condition. These people can bring order out of chaos and take delight in doing so. It's upon this kind of person and this kind of program I wish to focus. The REMIS Units that evolved under these conditions and that are now working successfully hold the key that can unlock a statewide system that could potentially make Illinois a national leader in media services for the handicapped.

I'm really only qualified to talk about one REMIS Unit and program — mine. But the validity of my program seems to have found justification and expression in other successful REMIS Units throughout the state. The paradigms operating in my program seem to be shared in others.

I'd like to share with you the creation of one of these units and attempt to identify the components of a model that could be used statewide.

The Making of a REMIS Unit

I was one of the original REMIS coordinators hired in the summer of 1974. In looking back on those early days, I'd have to consider myself one of the lucky ones. I had some significant things going for me at the start. I was given a practical operating budget and control of it. I received part of one of the defunct IMC (Instructional Media Centers — there were five serving the state) materials collections. I had a project director who believed in the purposes for which REMIS was created and who was willing, within limits, to let

me be my own boss; responsible only to him. He would let me run the REMIS Unit unhampered. If I failed to live up to the obligations I'd set for myself, he could fire me. If I succeeded, he would let me continue to operate with this degree of autonomy. This has proved to be an admirable working arrangement. Over the three years of our professional relationship, he has never faltered in his commitment to the REMIS Unit or his support for me. This has made working with others on the regional staff and in the school districts we serve far easier than it might have been. Belief and commitment on the part of the chief administrator at the start of any new program is paramount. As other professionals dealing with REMIS began to see its concepts becoming reality in their daily lives, they too became committed to the program.

My initial approach to the role of the REMIS coordinator differed from many of the others initially hired in the position. I saw the role chiefly in terms of an administrator — a planner, designer, and supervisor of all media related activities. Few, at that time, saw the job in those terms. Most saw a traditional media specialist — a doer — a guy concerned with immediate problems and solutions — working one-on-one with individual teachers. There is certainly nothing wrong with this approach in theory. It just didn't seem to match the reality of the situation we faced in the fall of 1974. To me such thinking indicated a preconceived notion of the problem and an inability to escape from habit. Nearly all who followed this approach failed within the first year.

After having conceived of the role in terms of administration, I began work on a methods approach to improve the existing conditions and discover some well-defined paths out of the basic dilemma. I will describe that basic dilemma shortly.

My overall strategy fell under three headings: scientific (logic), practical, and political. The scientific strategy made use of a basic design process which I will discuss below. The practical strategy consisted of accepting limits to what could be accomplished within given situations and maintaining a firm posture against attempts by others to expand those limits. (Never promise anything you can't deliver.) The political strategy is perhaps the hardest to describe. It consisted basically in discovering who has the power to hurt you or help you and their motivation for doing either. Learning to deal with power wielders is basically a matter of experience. A couple of bad experiences will educate you very quickly in the art.

Recently, I came across a design sequence that parallels fairly accurately my original thoughts on problem solving. I'd like to share it with you. Don Koberg and Jim Bagnell[1] give the following design process sequence:

Accept the Situation
state initial intentions, accept the problem as a challenge; give up your autonomy to the problem and allow the problem to become your process.

Analyse
get to know the ins and outs of the problem; discover what the world of the problem looks like.

Define
decide what you believe to be the main issues of the problem; conceptualize and clarify your major goals concerning the problem situation.

Ideate
search out all the ways of possibly getting to the major goals; think on alternatives.

Select
compare the goals as defined with possible ways of getting there; determine the best way to go.

Implement
give action or physical form to the selected "best ways."

Evaluate
determine the effects or ramifications as well as the degree of progress of the design activity.

This sequence can be seen in a variety of ways: linear, circular, feedback, branching, etc. In practical terms it makes little difference how you view it as long as you've followed the phases. If done successfully, your original point of departure or situation should have changed by the time you get back to it. This of course isn't the only kind of design process. You must select or evolve one that suits you and the situation you find yourself in. It's main criterion should be that you feel comfortable with it. Once selected such a sequence of thought allows you to gain conscious control of the problem situation. I travelled such a course in working on the dilemma facing REMIS in the fall of 1974.

[1] Don Koberg and Jim Bagnell, *The Universal Traveler* (Los Angeles: William Kaufman, Inc., 1974) pp. 16-17.

That basic dilemma I spoke of earlier is the enormous geographical size of most of the special education regions that REMIS found itself working in. They range from a few counties in size to more than twenty counties in some regions in the southern part of the state. My own region contains ten counties. Compounding the problem is the widely scattered populations found within these regions. Outside of metropolitan Chicago, there is relatively little population density to be found in the rest of the state. All of this might seem rather an obvious piece of observation to anyone living and working in Illinois. It may be so obvious that most of us don't see it. It simply exists as part of our reality. I was able to view it as an outsider from another state and I saw it existing in its problematic state. My task was to attempt to isolate its component parts and then try and develop methods which would improve the existing situation.

Up until now I've been talking a lot of theory. Theorizing has always been easy. It's turning theories into activities and making them useful that's the difficult part. Many people get hung up on theorizing and model building. I had originally thought of titling this piece: "REMIS . . . the Solution to the Pygmalion Syndrome." The pygmalion syndrome is an over infatuation with building models.[2] At times this syndrome seems to be epidemic among educators. In many ways its symptoms resemble a lawyer who loves to research and brief his case but never wants to go to court to try it. The end result is negligible. The client comes out the loser. Hence the present title of this piece: "Them As Can, Does." I'm concerned that you should know what we did after all the theorizing.

REMIS at Work

Having identified what I believed to be the basic dilemma, I needed to examine its effect on the population we were expected to serve.

The task was approached through the use of a computerized needs assessment of the teachers in our region. The survey covered such areas as overall media accessibility, varieties of materials available, media appropriateness for handicapping conditions and teaching task, media skill levels of teachers, etc.

The information gathered through the survey enabled us to form the long-range strategic goals for REMIS. Our primary goal became the decentralization of media services within the region.

Using the five areas of REMIS' responsibility I'd like to show you how we're working to achieve this goal.

Information Retrieval and Dissemination

Presently we're making use of media information service of NCEMMH (The National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped) at Ohio State University. Working through the A.L.R.C. #7 in Springfield we have access to NIMIS (National Instructional Materials Information System), the ERIC (Educational Resource Information Center) document service and the National Materials Center. In addition, the state of Illinois has just created the Illinois Retrieval and Dissemination Network, an educational information system created to serve all branches of education in the state. As of the writing of this article, the state staff is being in-serviced on the use of this system.

While these systems may still be in their infancies, I personally view information retrieval and dissemination as extremely important for the future activities of Special Education Media. I believe that in the near future we will see computer information systems such as those mentioned above prescribing and locating materials based on the individual needs of handicapped children. Public Law 94-142 which goes into effect this fall indicates a distinct trend in this direction.

REMIS currently functions and will function in the future as a major link for teachers in the field with such systems. Our office uses a silk screen printer to duplicate all information searches. We have the capability to duplicate any and all information passed on to us from the Illinois Office of Education. REMIS functions as an information broker at the local level. A teacher only needs to know one phone number to obtain pertinent special education information. The number of their local REMIS office.

Materials Accessibility

Materials accessibility is a major concern to every teacher working in the field. Our REMIS houses a central depository with approximately 6,000 items. Teachers are provided with access to these items through a printed catalog. Copies of this catalog were distributed throughout our region to teaching clusters (two special education classrooms or more within a building). Copies

[2] J. L. Synge, *Talking About Relativity*. (New York: Elsevier, 1970).

for itinerant teachers are available through the local Special Education District's Office. Copies have also been made available to parent groups and to teachers-in-training.

Our central depository is open thirteen hours a day to assist in information searches and the ordering of materials. Materials may be kept for two weeks and renewed as available. Materials are delivered by truck to satellite points in the region where they can be picked up and returned. There are currently three such satellites in operation. We plan to expand this number to ten next year. Geographically isolated areas currently receive materials by mail.

Two members of our staff are crucial in this operation. They are our clerk, who does the evening staffing, and our driver. Both positions were created using funds and personnel from the federal CETA (Comprehensive Employment Training Act) program. When you have limited resources, you develop and expand your program by whatever means. With people already functioning in a position and visable, it is much easier to make that position permanent at a later date. Both of these positions have been approved for funding through the regional program for next year.

In addition to the use of the materials in the central depository, teachers also have access to new materials for evaluation and purchase. Periodically, we provide teachers with new materials to evaluate on a 30 day basis. We provide an evaluation form to aid them in making a critical judgment of these materials. Teachers can then make recommendations for future purchases based on these evaluations. An item is never purchased by us without an evaluation having been carried out.

We also provide supplementary collections of materials through a series of teachers' centers we are creating. These supplementary collections are selected especially for the teachers served by the individual teachers' center. Each collection has its own catalog and these materials never circulate out of the area served by the center.

We are attempting through these efforts to provide a high degree of accessibility on a sound economic basis. School districts are finding it increasingly more difficult to supply teachers; in particular special education teachers who rely heavily on technologic aids in their teaching, with adequate amounts and varieties of materials. Our system spreads the cost over the largest population allowable thus reducing the overall cost of any one item.

Curriculum Development

This is high on our list of priorities. We want to see stronger curriculum guides developed at the state level and implemented at the local level, taking into consideration all those elements that make one locale different from another. Our main concern is effective integration of media into all curriculae.

We hope that effective use of P.L. 94-142 will help to insure this happening in the future. Currently we maintain close contact with teachers and supervisors through our teachers' center system and the media specialist who supervises their operation.

Our teachers' center system is crucial to our over-all decentralization plan and deserves some explanation.

We've just completed testing our model for this program and we're gratified by the results. We're planning to replicate the model three or four times throughout the region in the next few years.

Each teachers' center is a combination depository-professional library-production center-in-service unit. Assigned to the center is a media specialist who works with teachers and supervisors on a one-to-one relationship and in small groups. The media specialist is charged with the task of devising in-service programs commensurate with the skills of the teachers served by the center.

Systematic In-service

The media specialist's in-service programs are designed to satisfy the media training needs of teachers. Some of these needs are immediate, while others may be long-range. In order to guarantee that all teachers have the same basic skills, a core in-service program dealing with the fundamentals of media is provided. Additional programs dealing with such diverse areas as graphics in the classroom, single-concept filmmaking, and classroom use of videotape are also offered. The media specialist has the entire resources of REMIS and its staff to draw upon in creating his in-service programs. He does not work in isolation. His close working relationship with teachers and supervisors also helps guarantee that the in-service programs he gives will be meeting needs that the teachers actually have. REMIS tries to avoid the one-shot workshop that terminates the day of the in-service program. Our workshops tend to be sequential in nature, with a follow-up in the field and an assur-

ance that what was learned in a workshop can be put into practice. We believe that all in-service programs should work towards solving a particular identified problem. We further believe that all in-service programs should be judged effective not by how well they were received on the day they were given but by their eventual effect in the field. All REMIS in-service programs were developed and implemented with this in mind.

Materials Production

Each teachers' center contains a production facility where teachers are provided with instruction and materials for making their own classroom materials. Commercial producers of special education materials are still lagging behind the needs of teachers in the field and our teachers must still make many of their own materials. We wish to make this situation as pleasant and profitable an experience for teachers as possible. Many teachers are turned off by media because they think it takes too much time and is too complicated to serve their needs. We appreciate this initial attitude. It is our job to modify this attitude by providing guidance through our media specialist and adequate materials and equipment to make the job easier. The media specialist is expected to create a production notebook for teachers served by a teachers' center. This notebook contains a complete breakdown on equipment operation, media techniques, and their utilization in the classroom.

Our central depository staff also works with classes of graphic students at Northern Illinois University, where our offices are located, in developing new kinds of materials. We lend guidance and the students provide the imagination and skill. We have been involved in this program for three years and have found it increasingly successful and important to our work with teachers.

Public Awareness

Our REMIS functions as a consultation service for school districts and special education cooperatives wishing to create public awareness materials about handicapped children. We act as a focusing agent, clarifying problems and directing resources to produce optimum effects.

In addition to our basic consultation services we also provide the following direct services:

Editing—a client's written materials is examined for content clarity and effectiveness. Suggestions for changes are made when appropriate.

Graphic Design and Layout—our graphics specialist will match information content and financial resources to design. We will design and layout all materials to our client's taste and budget.

Photography—we have a fully equipped darkroom and can produce black and white and color prints, slides and filmstrips. The services of a skilled photographer are also available for any project requiring visual content.

Audio Recording and Mixing—we can produce audio tapes for slide/tape productions and any other public awareness projects requiring auditory presentation in our combination audio mixing and videotape editing booth.

Videotape—while most of our videotape work is centered around the use of videotape as a diagnostic tool, videotape services are also available for clients who wish to use this medium for public awareness.

All of the above services are offered to our clients free of charge. Our REMIS Unit is a major resource in our region for the production of public awareness materials. We can reduce the time and cost of producing public awareness materials of professional quality.

Conclusions

I think it justifiable to say that I consider this REMIS Unit to have proven itself effective in serving the information-media needs of special education personnel in our region. Its success stemmed from a number of identifiable factors. To recap:

(1) The problem was recognized and accepted.
(2) The REMIS coordinator had the support of the local administrative agency and was given the authority to be responsible for his own program.
(3) A fixed operational budget was established along with the discretionary power to spend it.
(4) Practical limits of accomplishments were set.
(5) A timetable was developed and held to.
(6) No one person was expected to do everything . . . additional qualified personnel were added as need and the budget permitted.
(7) I didn't become discouraged when my methods were not universally accepted.

Hostility and misunderstanding are part of the game. If everybody likes you, watch out . . . there is something wrong!

I believe that this REMIS Unit contains many of the elements needed to create a model that could be implemented statewide and provide effective and efficient information-media services for the special education community. I say this even with the knowledge that the basic special education structure in Illinois is changing.

The REMIS Unit I have been describing is flexible by design and responsive to the environment it exists in. It's more like a living plant than a mechanical structure in the way it functions. It bends with change; it doesn't break.

This REMIS Unit was designed as an operational whole. Every system consists of variables but some people make the mistake of viewing those variables in isolation and not as integrated parts of the whole system working together. The REMIS Unit can be viewed as a miniature network which is capable of being integrated and connected with other miniature networks to form larger and larger networks all of a whole. I believe it contains the seed for the creation of statewide REMIS model. A model capable of integrating individual REMIS Units into an organic whole in Illinois.

You may be wondering why I am concluding this article by focusing on a statewide REMIS model. It goes back to the initial isolation all of the REMIS Units started in. Some worked and others didn't. What's necessary is that all work. At this point in time, this can only occur by developing an effective model with characteristics shared by all REMIS Unit's and to connect them together into a state network. REMIS was originally set up to be a network and unfortunately it isn't one yet. It needs to become one in order to minimize waste and to maximize opportunities. REMIS success at the state level depends on ending the isolation of the REMIS Units, the successful ones, as well as the unsuccessful ones.

Successful statewide networking might be encouraged by creating and adapting a model and by creating series of mini-networks of REMIS Units existing in geographic proximity to one another. A pattern of three or four of these mini-networks covering the northern, central, and southern portions of Illinois could be organized. In fact a group of REMIS Units in the northern part of Illinois have formed themselves into a mini-network this past year to explore common problems and work on a REMIS model plan.

The monitoring of these mini-networks and the necessary interconnection between them could be carried out at the state level by a small section within the Illinois Office of Education charged with this task alone. This section could coordinate REMIS efforts statewide and act as the liaison between the REMIS Units and the Illinois Office of Education. This section would be involved in promoting mini-networking activities and full-scale networking in the state. It would have the power and ability to do those things that the REMIS Units couldn't do working alone.

The potential for a working REMIS Unit model for the state exists, as does the potential for an effective state network for media services for handicapped children. Success or failure is a matter of vision, as well as a matter of making visions come to life. *Them As Can, Does.*

Too often potentially successful programs or models are left to wither through indifference or the whimsical hope that something else will always come along to fill the gap that exists between need and service.

a program to enable visually impaired students in illinois to realize their full potential

margaret niederer
assistant manager for the department
of specialized educational services
illinois office of education
and
bobbie reguly
educational specialist for the department
of specialized educational services
illinois office of education

Services for the Visually Impaired, a program of the Illinois Office of Education's Department of Specialized Services, exists in order that students who are visually impaired may participate in the regular classroom to the fullest possible extent. This is in keeping with one of 23 goals of the Illinois Board of Education, which states that "the principle of least restrictive placement, 'mainstreaming' — placing exceptional students with all kinds of students — shall be followed whenever feasible."

Many visually impaired students require adapted materials and special aids in order to participate in the regular classroom, and to provide such materials is the primary purpose of Services for the Visually Impaired. The service now provides necessary materials for approximately 2,000 students in elementary and secondary programs and over 300 post high school students.

Who is Eligible?

Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education specify that a student is eligible when "visual impairment is such that the child cannot develop his or her education without special services and materials." This excludes students who have a deficiency in the process of perception, which would be considered a learning disability rather than a visual impairment. However, a student with *both* a visual impairment and a deficiency in perception would qualify.

Guidelines: Programming for the Visually Impaired suggests the following criteria for determining eligibility:

1. restricted field of vision,
2. marked correction, such as 20/200 corrected to 20/40,
3. recommendation of eye specialist,
4. corrected acuity of 20/70 or less in the better eye,
5. serious, progressive eye difficulties as noted by an eye specialist on an ocular report.

In addition, the following eye conditions may warrant *temporary* placement in a special program:

1. prolonged occlusion for amblyopia,
2. acute, irritated eye disease during prolonged treatment,
3. postoperative retinal detachment or other postoperative condition.

The final determination as to a student's eligibility for special services and materials is made by a multidisciplinary staff conference.

What is Available?

Services for the Visually Impaired maintains a depository of materials on the premises at the Illinois Office of Education, 100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois 62777. These materials include Braille, large print, and recorded textbooks and frequently ordered equipment and tangible aids. If a needed item is not in the depository, staff members can usually obtain it through some voluntary organization or commercial supplier.

If a book title is not available in adapted form from any source, the staff will order that it be transcribed, duplicated, or microfilmed. In this instance, two regularly printed copies of the book must first be supplied by the ordering district or private school, one for transcribing and one for proofreading.

At the present time, most orders that can be filled from the Illinois Office of Education's depository are processed and shipped within one week. However, since more than half of the orders require turning to outside sources, it is recommended that

orders for the school year beginning in September be placed no later than March 1.

A Brief History

What is today known as Services for the Visually Impaired was originally outlined by the Illinois General Assembly in 1965. Article 14 of The School Code, which defines services and programs for handicapped children, was established, and one section of it stated:

> There shall be established within the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (Illinois Office of Education) under the direction of the Superintendent, an educational materials coordinating unit for handicapped children to provide (1) staff and resources for the coordination, cataloging, standardizing, production, procurement, storage, and distribution of educational materials needed by visually handicapped children and adults. (14-11.01)

The agency was originally known as the Educational Coordinating Unit and located in Chicago. It began its work by contacting all Illinois school districts and asking them to send in any materials they then had to form the basis of the loan collection. The unit also contacted representatives from volunteer agencies, teachers, and other educators interested in the education of visually impaired students, and an advisory committee to the unit was thus formed. An early publication of this committee, *Rates and Standards for Volunteers Engaged in the Production of Braille, Large Type, or Tape Recorded Material for the Visually Handicapped* (Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967) was of great value in enabling volunteer agencies to standardize their methods and function as effectively as possible in contributing to the program. (This publication has just been revised and updated and will be available upon request from the Illinois Office of Education.)

Because funding was limited and the unit wished to give the most complete and effective assistance possible to each child served, the program was initially limited to students on the elementary level. When additional funding made it possible to include students on the secondary level, basic procedures had already been clearly defined, and the expanded program was quickly implemented.

Since July of 1975, the office has also been extending services to post secondary level students. The Johanna Bureau for the Blind in Chicago is under contract to serve college students directly. Students send requests and books to the bureau, and the bureau in turn ships materials to the students and bills the Illinois Office of Education.

In addition to meeting the needs of the individual college student, the Services for the Visually Impaired also *initiated a grant* with the Illinois Division of Vocational Rehabilitation which resulted in (1) development of a recording agency at Lincoln Land Community College in Springfield, (2) a statewide conference at Lincoln Land Community College on the vocational future of the visually impaired, and (3) establishment of study centers for the visually impaired at Northern Illinois University, Southern Illinois University, Illinois State University, and Parkland Community College. The study centers assure ready availability of the most frequently needed materials and other items which are too expensive or too cumbersome for students to have in dormitories.

With the Help of Many Others

The depository services in Springfield are maintained by a staff of four professional and nine support workers, with additional contractual help during peak periods of circulation. For its total operation, however, the unit is dependent upon the cooperation of educators of the visually impaired and volunteer agencies within Illinois.

The volunteer agencies, especially those which produce Braille and recordings, have contributed greatly to the success of the program. While there are still handling charges, proofreading fees, and costs of actual materials, this voluntary contribution of services enables the program to do more within its budgetary limitations than would otherwise be possible. All of the following volunteer agencies have supported the program since its inception, with the exception of the Naperville Transcribing Club, which was not founded until 1973:

Johanna Bureau for the Blind and Visually Handicapped
Lauraine Jackson, Executive Chairman
22 West Madison, Chicago, Illinois 60602
Telephone: (312) 332-6076

Catholic Guild for the Blind
William Lynch, Executive Director
180 North Michigan, Room 1720, Chicago, Illinois 60601
Telephone: (312) 236-8569

The Braille Transcribers Club of Illinois
Mrs. H. C. Peterson, Contact Chairman
7240 North Overhill Avenue, Chicago Illinois 60648
Telephone: (312) 774-6638

Naperville Area Transcribing for the Blind
Mrs. Gloria K. Buntrock, Coordinator
645 North Webster Street, Naperville, Illinois 60540
Telephone: (312) 420-1863

In addition the service cooperates with the Recordings for the Blind, an agency which provides recorded educational materials at no charge to eligible individuals. They may be contacted directly by individuals desiring information or services.

Recordings for the Blind
215 East 58th Street
New York, New York 10022

Thirteen regional vision coordinators meet regularly with the Service for the Visually Impaired staff to discuss any problems in delivery and determine possible improvements in service to students. When the Service for the Visually Impaired recently indicated the need in having teachers increase their skills in vision assessment, the vision coordinators took the initiative and in cooperation with Illinois State University and Northern Illinois University, supported a functional vision assessment workshop at Illinois State University, with additional field follow-up activities. The vision coordinators responsible for the 13 regional programs are:

Arthur Bennett, Supervisor
Programs for the Visually Impaired
Muldoon Special Education Center
121 South Stanley Street, Rockford, Illinois 61102
Telephone: (309) 968-0871

Betty Crump, Vision Coordinator
Mid-Central Association, Special Education Office
3202 North Wisconsin, Peoria, Illinois 61603
Telephone: (309) 672-6715

Julie Goldman, Vision Coordinator
Special Education District of Lake County
4440 West Grand Avenue, Gurnee, Illinois 60031
Telephone: (312) 623-0021, Ext. 245

Roselyn McHatton, Vision Coordinator
West Central Association
730 East Vine, Springfield, Illinois 62703
Telephone: (217) 525-3022

Jean Schneider, Vision Coordinator
Western Illinois Association, Weston School
850 Mulberry, Galesburg, Illinois 61401
Telephone: (309) 342-5126

Carolyn Schumacher, Vision Coordinator
Regional Service Agency
9440 Kenton, Skokie, Illinois 60076
Telephone: (312) 679-7950

Carol Shipp, Vision Coordinator
East-Central Counties Association
354 West Main Street, Decatur, Illinois 62522
Telephone: (217) 429-0650

Noel Stephens, Vision Coordinator
Northwestern Illinois Association
145 Fisk Avenue, DeKalb, Illinois 60115
Telephone: (815) 758-0636

Shirley Sylvester, Vision Coordinator
Educational Regional Association
J.F. Kennedy Diagnostic Clinic
420 North Raynor, Joliet, Illinois 60435
Telephone: (815) 727-6431, Ext. 41

Rosemary Welsch, Consultant
Division of Blind and Partially Seeing
Chicago Board of Education
228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60601
Telephone: (312) 641-4133

Leslie Williams, Vision Coordinator
South Metropolitan Association
250 West Sibley Boulevard, Dolton
P.O. Harvey, Illinois 60426
Telephone: (312) 841-7800

David Ziff, Vision Coordinator
Southwestern Regional Special Education
1826 Jerome Lane, Cahokia, Illinois 62206
Telephone: (618) 332-6576

Joan Egyrud, Vision Coordinator
West Suburban Association
141 Green Valley Drive, Lombard, Illinois 60148
Telephone: (312) 629-7272

Other persons, from points of contact at colleges to individual volunteers and classroom teachers, are, of course, too numerous to mention. They are all an important part of a state service that in a little more than a decade has proven an indispensable help to visually impaired students in Illinois.

Bibliography

Calovini, Gloria. "Educational Materials Coordinating Unit: Visually Handicapped," *Illinois Journal of Education*, vol. 59, no. 4 (April 1968), pp. 82-85.

Illinois. Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. *Guidelines: Programming for the Visually Impaired (To accompany The Rules and Regulations To Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education, Effective July 1, 1973)*. Springfield, Illinois: (author), 1973.

Illinois. Illinois Office of Education. *Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education*. Springfield, Illinois: (author), 1976.

Illinois. Illinois Office of Education. State Board of Education. *State Board of Education Goals Statement*. Springfield, Illinois: (author), 1975.

Illinois. Superintendent of Public Instruction. *Rates and Standards for Volunteers Engaged in the Production of Braille, Large Type or Tape Recorded Materials for the Visually Handicapped*. Springfield, Illinois: (author), 1967.

Illinois. Illinois Office of Education. *Standards, Guidelines and Rates for the Production of Braille, Large Type and Recorded Materials for the Illinois Office of Education (Draft Edition)*. Springfield, Illinois: (author), 1977.

the role of the library in gifted child education

joyce van tassel
coordinator
illinois gifted program
illinois office of education

Historically, libraries have not played a major role in the education of the gifted child or at least they have not been utilized as a deliberate approach to meeting his needs. Yet, we all know of many gifted children who have made the library their special province for exploration and learning. And the results from such self-exploration have lead the way to great research efforts, promising literary works, and significant contributions in specific fields. Therefore, perhaps it is time to take a closer look at the role of the library in the whole process of educating the gifted.

In truth, the library offers the three most important components in educating a gifted child: (1) a conducive climate, (2) a plethora of resource materials, and (3) a trained professional who can guide independent work. Each of these three is essential if the gifted child is to profit from the educational setting in which he is confined.

A Conducive Climate

Much has been written about the characteristics of the gifted child. He has been seen as more curious, more flexible, more able to probe in depth issues, more healthy, and more stable than age peers. And research, particularly Terman's, supports this view wholeheartedly. What then can be such a child's fate in the regular classroom setting? Either he finds positive or negative ways to circumvent the boredom in a mediocre classroom environment or he turns off the scene completely through immersion in the level at which the classroom operates, a level many times several grade levels below the child's achievement and many rungs below the child's potential.

One way to alleviate this situation is to allow the gifted child to spend at least part of his day in another environment outside the classroom, one that provides him with openness and flexibility of space as well as the opportunity to manipulate a variety of materials which might spark his interest. Such a place might be the school's library, today euphemistically termed the "learning center." It is in this kind of setting that the natural characteristics of the gifted child will have a chance to grow and develop at his own rate rather than at the rate of a whole class. It is here that the gifted child can channel his curiosity and interest into productive tasks.

Unlimited Resource Materials

Dr. Joseph Renzulli, a prolific writer in the field of gifted education, has recently developed an enrichment triad which explores three types of enrichment for the gifted. The one type that Dr. Renzulli advocates strongly involves the concept of gifted students working "in the field," utilizing the same tools as professionals in order to complete a project. Therefore, a basal reader at the fifth grade level is of little use to a fourth grade girl working on the production of a literary magazine. However, back copies of *The English Journal* might be helpful or the *MLA Stylesheet* or other publications at the professional level which could be used as a model or contain information on performing the task itself. Only a school learning center could offer the range of materials necessary for such a student to pursue such a project.

In reality, the ultimate purpose of the best approaches to gifted education implies the goal of making the child an independent thinker and doer at as early an age as possible. In order to realize that goal, the library/learning center with all of its materials and resources must be tapped early in these children's school careers. The gifted child must learn the processes by which knowledge

becomes manifest as well as the products which can emanate from new applications of that knowledge. Contact with and research work in appropriate materials can provide the gifted with such insights.

A Trained Professional

The climate and the materials are important considerations, but human interaction is perhaps the most important ingredient of all in the education of a gifted child.

Few gifted children can succeed at independent work on the project without the nurture of a human being, a "teacher" if you will, to guide and encourage their efforts. Many would argue that only the classroom teacher can provide this service. However, it has been demonstrated through numerous programs that community people, college professors, and organized groups can also meet this need. Yet few programs have seriously looked to the librarian and his aides as key people for providing such a service.

Yet with a minimum of extra training, this group of people represents perhaps the most logical helpers to the gifted child since by virtue of their training, librarians are guidance-oriented and directed toward making those with whom they come in contact independent learners. In addition, they can teach the gifted the process skills necessary to do independent work as well as acquaint them with the alternative resources at their disposal.

A Matter of Economics

Since it is a cruel fact that very little money exists anywhere in the nation to educate adequately the gifted child population, it behooves gifted educators to look for "economical" ways of meeting the challenge. Here again, the library learning center concept provides a viable alternative. A full-time person in such a crucial facility can work with small groups of gifted children at least once a week, thus providing a gifted program at whatever grade levels are desired. Coordination and scheduling can be worked out with regular classroom teachers as well as identification of independent project areas. And two goals are achieved: the gifted child has a program to stimulate and challenge him and the library/learning center has proved itself an invaluable resource to the school in meeting the needs of an underserved population.

A Prototype

One district in Illinois which utilizes the learning center and its staff specifically to meet the needs of its gifted population is Granite City Unit District. The program began at Frohardt School and has now begun to be replicated throughout the district. The learning center specialist meets at least fifty minutes per week with identified gifted children at grade levels 4-6 in small groups of eight to ten; the children brainstorm on projects they would like to do and input is also suggested by learning center specialist. Out of such sessions emerge group projects such as designing a futuristic school as well as individual projects such as creating a futuristic city. Children work on their projects during their scheduled time in the learning center, but also at other times throughout the week, including lunch hours and before and after school. They have learned that the center can be a real source of stimulation and interest for them, and thus they spend as much time there as possible.

The program was conceived and developed in cooperation with the Area Service Center for Gifted in that region as well as the gifted program coordinator for the district.

A resource team including the school principal, classroom teachers, learning center specialist, and resource teacher hold a staffing to determine student placement and recommend special approaches and/or curricular directions. Periodic follow-up sessions are held to keep all members of the resource team aware of individual as well as group problems with the gifted program. In this way, the learning center specialist can coordinate the program effectively with the classroom teacher so that both work for the best interests of the gifted child.

Granite City's program is not unique, but it does offer a prototype for further involvement on the part of school library staffs across the country in gifted education.

Other Approaches

However, libraries need not focus on independent research projects as the only mode for working with gifted children. Other approaches are effective too. To name a few:

(1) Librarians can start book clubs for gifted children who excel in reading. Newberry Award winners, Caldecott winners, or the Junior Great Books program provide a ready-made list of appropriate reading materials for an able group of elementary children. The club

can meet once a week to discuss books read during the previous week. The librarian can act as discussion leader or ask a student to assume the role each time.

(2) The library can be the site for research seminars at the high school level. On a regular basis, gifted children can meet and discuss research topics of interest to them and share information on doing original research as well as utilizing research findings effectively in other endeavors.

(3) Special programmed materials can be placed in the library for use by gifted students at preassigned times during the day. The librarian or aide need only provide general supervision as students can learn to manipulate the materials by themselves. Whole groups of gifted children have learned foreign language through just such an approach.

Thus it can be seen that library services can provide a very real vehicle for improving the lot of gifted children in any given school district. If the commitment to gifted child education is present, then the mobilization of available resources to do the job can occur. And all educators are the winners if these children have the opportunity to achieve their potential in an atmosphere of openness and exploration.

providing mediated services for the handicapped - a community college learning resources center perspective

kenneth w. allen
assistant dean of instruction for the
transfer programs and learning resources center
waubonsee community college
and
gary frazer
director of audiovisual services
waubonsee community college
sugar grove, illinois

The Learning Resources Center in the community college places primary emphasis upon meeting the needs of students within a changing environment, the community. Consequently, the environment of the institution must be one that can and will respond to many combinations of aptitudes, abilities, desires to learn, and methods of instruction.

Students with learning difficulties have been accommodated to a limited extent in grades K-12 for several years. However, those same students who wish to extend themselves and enroll in curricula beyond the secondary years have been given few opportunities in pursuing their interests. Only since Congress passed the Vocational Act have funds been available for the development of programs for the handicapped in post-secondary institutions. Subsequent amendments to the original Vocational Act have provided the additional revenues needed to implement training programs for the handicapped student which require a substantial base to continue their existence. Two special programs have been developed at Waubonsee Community College in Sugar Grove, Illinois, for the expressed purpose of serving the needs of handicapped students.

In the fall of 1972, Waubonsee Community College initiated a pilot program for the hearing handicapped student in cooperation with the Illinois Community College System. In the past five years, approximately 200 hearing impaired students from throughout the state of Illinois have enrolled in the program. The Waubonsee Hearing Impaired Program philosophy is based on the premise that given proper supportive services the hearing handicapped student can complete a course of study.

The second program is designed for functionally illiterate adults. This program, Right to Read, grew out of national studies and surveys during the 1960s which identified the severity of the literacy problem. In 1972, Phase II of the Right to Read effort was begun through the Cooperative Re-

search Act. This Act provided funds to train Right to Read directors. The instructor responsible for reading at Waubonsee was trained by the state of Illinois as one of the first Right to Read directors in the state under this program.

In 1976, Title VII grant funds were legislated by Congress for use strictly by the National Right to Read Program. These funds were given to institutions which demonstrated an institutional commitment to solving the problem of illiteracy in adults. Waubonsee was one of those awarded the Title VII funds. The basic philosophy of the Right to Read Program is that an adult who is functionally illiterate can, given the proper supportive services, become a functioning literate contributor to society.

Waubonsee Hearing Impaired Program — WHIP

There are many aspects of service when one talks about developing programs for the handicapped. However, the staff at Waubonsee found it difficult to develop an effective program for overcoming the obstacles identified by the needs of the handicapped without involving the services of the Learning Resources Center. Consequently, LRC staff were asked for their input during the planning stages of the proposal writing. The need for hardware and software items was discussed. Specifications, titles, and prices for the items were set forth according to the perceived learning approaches to be utilized. The finished product in each case, the proposal, included a comprehensive LRC support system to aid each program for the handicapped in achieving success.

As expected, the selection of materials was a long and arduous process. The criteria in each case was very restrictive in terms of needed information. Both programs wanted to emphasize the basic skill-oriented experiences and minimize the theoretical approach. The hearing impaired program wished to develop instructional modules in support of training the hearing impaired student for vocationally-oriented careers. Besides investigating the myriad of software companies, the Regional Media Center for the Deaf located in Knoxville, Tennessee, was contacted for materials it might be able to share with the WHIP program. A few of the materials were obtained but the majority were locally produced by the audiovisual center at Waubonsee. The well-equipped LRC provides the necessary equipment and duplicate copies of materials for review by the student. However, students are encouraged to initially work at the appropriate work stations.

Since sight is the main communicative device with the hearing impaired, it was decided to place emphasis on slide and videotape production. Since many of the vocational programs in which WHIP students are enrolled at the college are already individualized utilizing a sound/slide system with emphasis on hands-on experience, the incorporation of the new materials into the learning system for the student was a smooth transition. Obviously, the sound portion of the sound/slide system was of no use to the hearing impaired student. With the cooperation of each instructor, a written script was created to accompany each slide. Also provided on the script are suggestions for stopping, reviewing, testing, and other needed processes. The scripts have worked so well that even normal hearing students ask to use them for review.

One of the problems for the hearing impaired student is to find out what is occurring campuswide. Since there are presently 65-70 students enrolled in the program, it is difficult to communicate with each one. There is a campus newspaper and this does provide much of the needed information. However, once a week, the TV/Radio Journalism classes produce a half-hour videotape about the latest developments at the campus. This information is usually more current than the newspaper since the paper is published only on a bimonthly basis. With help from the students in the WHIP program, the news broadcasts are provided with sign language utilizing a corner insert. The students have used this opportunity to study the television medium more closely. The participation in the "team" has provided a human element of being needed for the handicapped student.

Videotape is also the medium used for certain skills which need to be studied as continuous processes. Recently, a series of videotapes were produced locally which inform the student about vocational opportunities for the hearing impaired as well as job interviewing techniques to be utilized in order to assist students in meeting realistic career aspirations. Videotapes have been produced of vocationally-oriented processes for individual review by the students.

An outgrowth of the WHIP program has been an interpreter training program. In its second year of operation, this program seeks to train interpreters for positions in an area of proven need. With over one-half million deaf people in the United States today, individual services are badly needed. The program at Waubonsee is seeking to

provide some of the needed relief. The instructional strategies for this program mix traditional classroom methods with those of individual learning. In addition to meeting in group lecture twice a week, the students are required to read and view materials placed on reserve in the LRC.

The WHIP students study in a variety of the fifty vocational/technical certificate programs. These diversified interests as well as those of the interpreter training program have caused a marked increase in the number of journals ordered in the LRC. Since it is the LRCs responsibility to assist in providing as many learning materials as possible for the student, special attention has been given to the access of such materials. A variety of journals not only have been necessary for the WHIP program, but the Right to Read Program as well.

Right to Read — R2R

It is reported that the average reading level of most journals ordered by colleges is at least tenth grade and above. The Right to Read students, being readers of sixth grade material and below, created a challenge for the LRC staff in the selection of materials. The first acquisition was one hundred books chosen by the R2R director as being appropriate for these students. These books were placed on a special rack in the main corridor of the library and labeled as available to R2R students only. This served as a reinforcement of the importance of the R2R student — he/she had their own specialized collection. Contrary to what one might believe, this idea fostered pride in the students.

Since the grant proposal for this program called for very specific diagnostic and learning materials, the acquisition of workbooks and media materials was not difficult. There were, however, several areas of learning which demanded unique learning packets which were not available. Not only is it necessary to teach the skill of reading to illiterate adults, it is also necessary to teach survival skills. These skills are: reading and understanding road signs to pass a driver's license exam, completing a job application, reading and understanding labels on drugs and food, computing the cost of food or purchased items, balancing a checkbook, and many other areas. Since this is a new area of emphasis in education, few materials exist which meet the complete needs of the students in this particular program. The LRC staff was asked for their input in designing learning packets for use in an individualized approach. Those materials which were available were previewed and individual selections or entire series were purchased. By working as a team, each set of materials was brought together into "learning modules" which allow self-paced learning in a non-threatening environment. All of these materials, available in the R2R Learning Center, are also housed in the main college LRC. The idea is to move the student into the main flow of learning activity — not to isolate him/her. As the first year is about to end on this program, the rate of success is reflected in very positive terms by the enthusiasm generated by the students who participated and by the community.

The training of the R2R volunteer tutors is a very integral part of the R2R program. Besides the development of learning packets for student use, the LRC team was called upon to work with the R2R director and another reading specialist to develop complete training materials for use with the tutor-training program. Resource materials including supplementary texts, audio tapes, visuals, and evaluation instruments were developed and field-tested before implementation. The success of the R2R tutor program depends upon consistency. Use of the LRC-developed program has provided consistency in the training of over eighty tutors.

Participation

Not only have students been enthusiastic about the new opportunity afforded them in both the WHIP and R2R programs at Waubonsee, but the faculty and staff of the LRC have become equally as dedicated to the objectives set forth in both programs. Many of the LRC staff have participated in sign language classes in order to better communicate with hard of hearing students as they use the LRC services. Several students in the WHIP program have been hired as work-study students to help in processing and disseminating materials used in their programs.

The Learning Resources Center staff has also become personally involved in the R2R Program. Several of the staff members have volunteered their time as tutors for the non-reading adults. Some have donated time to canvass the local community informing citizens of the program's availability. Learning Resources Center personnel have also served on the local advisory council which makes decisions regarding the direction of the program.

Summary

There is little doubt that education of handicapped students is a difficult task. Lack of proper funding and shortage of quality materials makes working in this area a challenge for any LRC. The challenges outlined above were met only through cooperation between the LRC and the many faculty members who have handicapped students in their classes. Many long hours of consultation were needed to develop and implement each project. Growth has not been only a student phenomenon in these projects — each of us involved has grown to recognize the importance of the phrase, "humanization in education."

illinois office of education/school district partnership: improving school media and library services

marie sivak
library/media educational consultant
illinois office of education

When the Illinois Office of Education was reorganized in December 1976, a new means for providing comprehensive technical assistance to local school districts was developed. This change came about as the result of a desire to improve the mode of service by forming Regional Program Service teams.

The major functions of these five teams are to provide assistance directly to the local education agencies in establishing and improving programs; disseminating IOE publications, regulations, guidelines, and general information; communicating school concerns to the Illinois Office of Education; providing help in preparation/review of proposals for grants. In other words they serve as "linkers" of all types of information between the state education agency and the school district.

Additionally, in order to add the subject area information service, the Program Planning and Development Section was created. This section includes such programs or curricular areas as library/media, foreign languages, Right-to-Read, safety education, and speech/drama. Each member of the Program Planning and Development has participated in the training of cooperating consultants who are yet another extension of the Illinois Office of Education services to the local school district.

Identification of potential cooperating consultants was made through professional organizations, Program Service Team members, Regional Superintendents, and Program Planning and Development staff. The school administrators were then contacted in order to gain their permission and cooperation to release these teachers, specialists, and university or college professionals for three to five days during the year to provide subject-related consultant services to schools. The selected cooperating consultants were then provided two days of intensive consultant skills and knowledge. Currently over 400 Illinois professionals have been prepared in 15 subject areas as consultants. Thirty-one of these are media specialists. The cooperating consultants may be contacted by school administrators through the Program Service Team member in their geographical area.

These changes are an attempt to better achieve a partnership role between the Illinois Office of Education and the local education agencies.

To further this partnership Dr. Joseph M. Cronin, State Superintendent of Education, appointed a Media and Library Advisory Committee consisting of educators representing local and regional concerns in May 1975. Members of this committee include:

Robert E. Abbott, Consultant, Special Education
Waukegan Community Unit School District #60
1721 Golf Road, Waukegan, Illinois 60085
Telephone: (312) 336-3100

*Dale "Hank" Hanneken, Assistant Principal
Mattoon Senior High School
2461 Walnut Avenue, Mattoon, Illinois 61938
Telephone: (217) 234-6415

Mrs. Dawn Heller, Media Services Coordinator
Riverside-Brookfield Township District #208
Riverside-Brookfield High School
Ridgewood and Golf Road, Riverside, Illinois 60546
Telephone: (312) 442-7500

Sister Kathleen LaPlume
St. Hubert School
125 Grand Canyon Avenue
Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60172
Telephone: (312) 885-7702

Dr. Margaret Moore, Unit Librarian
Harrisburg Community Unit School District #3
40 South Main Street, Harrisburg, Illinois 62946
Telephone: (618) 253-7637

Viola Moore, Media Specialist
Corliss High School
821 East 103rd Street, Chicago, Illinois 60628
Telephone: (312) 821-2507

F. Leon Rodgers, Superintendent
Delavan Community Unit School District #703
907 Locust Street, Delavan, Illinois 61734
Telephone: (309) 244-8283

Joan Roeder, Media Specialist
East Peoria School District #86
300 Oakwood Avenue, East Peoria, Illinois 61611
Telephone: (309) 699-4411

Marie Rose Sivak, Educational Consultant
Library/Media, Program Planning and Development
Illinois Office of Education
100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois 62777
Telephone: (217) 782-2826

**Robert T. Williamson, Assistant Regional Superintendent
Peoria County Courthouse, Room 501
Peoria, Illinois 61602
Telephone: (309) 672-6906

Dr. Donald Winsor, Director
Learning Resources Services
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Telephone: (618) 453-2258

* Chairperson
** Recorder

The Media and Library Advisory Committee has met four times for the primary purpose of gaining a deeper understanding of the Illinois Office of Education's role in the development of school media centers and libraries. Presentations made to the group included: learning what data bases exist and are available from Research and Statistics for decision making; state and federal legislation as it relates to school media programs; the Illinois Free Textbook Program; the Illinois Resource Dissemination Network; revision of A-160; ETV-ITV; and Public Law 94-142 which guarantees educational services to handicapped children.

As a direct result of one of the meetings, three members of the committee, Dawn Heller, Sister Kathleen LaPlume, and Viola Moore were invited to assist in writing the State Plan which provides for cooperation between media specialists and special education teachers. The fourth meeting of this committee dealt with reviewing the accomplishments of the committee during the year as well as determining what is still to be done as the committee continues in the future.

From the original goals set by the committee, it was felt that the following had been accomplished:

1. A-160 (Document #1) changes instigated and some changes accomplished upon recommendation of the committee in the media area.
2. Data base has been updated and areas identified by the Illinois Office of Education, Research and Statistics, utilizing the suggestions of the committee.
3. At least four exemplary school media programs within the state have been identified; they are Wheaton Community Unit School District #200, Palatine Community Consolidated School District #51, Pekin School District #108, and Rosemont Elementary School District #78.
4. A task competencies for clerical library staff checklist has been developed; however, the checklist needs revision, but publication is expected by spring 1978.

Some of the items yet to be accomplished were discussed in great detail and include the need for monies to maintain and improve media programs. Essential components of a good media program need to be identified and ways in which to make the media program more visible need to be determined and implemented. In addition, the advisory committee recommended that universities and other teacher training institutions include a media training course for both administrators and for teachers to earn certificates. This committee will be continued whether or not House Bill 601 is passed into law by the state legislature and signed by the Governor.

Through the provision of technical assistance by media specialists via the Program Service Teams and the accomplishments of the Media and Library Advisory Committee, the Illinois Office of Education hopes to give the necessary supportive service to allow school districts to improve library/media programs effectiveness within existing fiscal parameters.

unspecial education materials

terry denny
university of illinois
urbana-champaign campus

The passing years will show if special education can survive its name. Whoever coined the adjective "special" did disservice to the field as I see it. There is very little that can be called special in a non-trivial way about much of what goes on in the field.

Appropriate adjustments are made by teachers to the students' cognitive emotional or physical entry behaviors. That's called teaching. Particular attention is paid to the quality of the instructional environment provided for students. Nothing special there either. Particular learner characteristics are noted and tended to accordingly. Indeed, the learner may have a surfeit of talent or energy and thereby require the careful planning and instructional attention of the teacher.

But that's what teachers are supposed to do anyway, whether they be "regular" or "special" education teachers. Two decades ago David Ausubel soundly advised all who would be called teacher to determine where the child was and teach him accordingly. Last year Benjamin Bloom summarized scores of studies from here and abroad which revealed the human characteristics associated with school learning.[1] He concludes that a sensible school environment can make a huge difference in what a child learns. Old stuff: nothing special about that.

I have seen a few dozen "special" education teachers in action in my days and I can honestly say I was unable to recognize anything unusual about how they worked with their children. Sensibly? You bet. Peculiar, esoteric, abberant, strange? No more than their "regular" counterparts. I offer these remarks to help you understand better why I have grave doubts about the special education instructional materials market. I remain to be convinced that much of it will not suffer from the same false labeling; from the same mystique; from the same verbal magic that plagues the regular educational materials market. Here are four facets of the world of instructional materials in which teachers live.

(1) Local educational decision-makers suffer from a plethora of information about commercial products, the vast majority of which have been developed in a traditional manner, and a paucity of information and services related to products generated from a sound research and development base;

(2) Local selection committees do not follow procedures that guarantee that decisions will be based on a systematic review of — or even on a cursory examination of — *all* relevant educational product options;

(3) Most local school systems are not aware that relevant research and development-based options are available; and

(4) Most systems do not take the care needed to install and maintain well-developed product options.

Robert Wolf turned up some interesting results in a study of how teachers used "individualized" instructional materials.[2] He writes:

> For one thing this study has documented the fact that the individual instructional materials surveyed here mostly account for learner rate but not for learner interest or style of learning.

Wolf continues:

> . . . of the most significant findings were that slow learners did not benefit from the materials studied here as much as average and bright students did.

Successful implementation products are characterized by enormously important local tailoring. Options and adaptation are crucial ingredients for success, in my view. The EPIE Institute, a remarkable organization that captured my fancy several years ago has attempted[3] to rationalize the selection process and the use of instrumental materials. EPIEs work reveals again and again the likelihood of local adaptation of instructional products and

Terry Denny is a professor of Education at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign Campus. His expertise in the evaluation of instructional materials is acclaimed in Arthur, Illinois and elsewhere. His credentials for writing about special education are less recognized: he has no formal training or work experience in special education as his article amply reveals. For two decades hundreds of special educators have tried desperately to enlighten him. Their efforts are acknowledged and the readers' reactions to his ideas are welcome. (Editors note: This was written by the author!)

systems when the implementation is successful. But flexible local adaptation is more a hallmark of success than a criterion. The first criterion is obviously continued *use*. If the outcome isn't durable over time, there is nothing to study. Once an outcome is used, over time, one can turn to matters relating to the quality of use. Quality must not be restricted to student outcomes, no more than student outcomes can be overlooked. The key in my experience is *what the product does for the teacher*.

I think that it is fair to say that by and large the teacher of handicapped learners rarely has had any more training in the selection and use of instructional materials than the regular classroom teacher. Nevertheless, I think that it is also fair to say that the teacher of the handicapped tends to give much more attention to, and is much more concerned about, the effectiveness and appropriateness of a specific instructional material than is the regular classroom teacher. I find teachers of the handicapped actively concerned with the appropriateness of a particular material for a particular learner in their class. Not surprisingly they want to know more about how to select (or adapt) a material to match their diagnosis of an individual learner's needs (and many wanted training in diagnosing those needs).

There are two compelling reasons for viewing the next few years in special education as an opportunity for those of us who seek more rational development, selection, and use of educational materials on the market.

First — Education for the handicapped is receiving visibility and funding — both of which can be used to give it clout in the materials marketplace.

Second — Teachers of the handicapped are (by the very nature of the broad range of instructional problems they face) more aware of the need to have materials that are designed to help them *in-struct* rather than simply to help structure classroom time and activity.

"Sophistication" is a rarity in product selection and implementation in the public schools. Indeed, when I have found it to exist it does not necessarily have the covariates that one might expect when one thinks of a "sophisticated" school district: large, wealthy, suburban, highly visible leadership, and a reputation for welcoming innovative practice, to mention but five characteristics. I find implementation of R & D-based materials is as likely to have occurred in a small, modestly financed, rural district as it is in the previously stated stereotypic setting.

Instructional Materials for Handicapped Learners

There are many factors influencing the instruction of handicapped learners in classroom learning tasks in addition to the availability, selection, and effective use of appropriate instructional materials. However, I leave the discussion of those other factors to others. I focus on instructional materials if for no other reason than because instructional materials are such a "given" in the classroom — so much a part of the "woodwork," as it were — that the role they play in the day-to-day, moment-to-moment business of classroom life is simply taken for granted. As a result, the underlying values of the process that delivers to, and that maintains the use of these materials in, the regular classroom have hardly been examined.

Although instructional materials are constantly being evaluated by materials producers, by state and local materials' committees, as well as by the teachers who choose and use materials with learners, these evaluations seldom have as their primary focus the issue of a material's actual instructional effectiveness with learners.

The few researchers (and there are very few indeed) who have studied what goes on in classrooms produce studies that tell us (when they mention materials at all) that "a standard textbook was being used"; or that "the control classes used the regular textbook and the experimental classes used instructional television." Hardly ever do we hear anything more specific about the materials — about their specific intents, contents, their implicit or explicit goals, objectives, instructional strategies. It's as though every textbook and every instructional television program or film were the same as the next. If they are so much alike, why keep publishing and producing so many of them?

Non-print Materials

In order for teachers and students to be able to make the most productive use of the many non-print instructional materials which are available, these materials need to be better integrated into the overall design of instruction both in and outside the classroom. That is, whatever a language arts sound filmstrip has to offer in the way of objective content, and teaching/learning activities should fit well into the objective content and methodology of the overall design of the language

arts program for that classroom — and especially with the components of whatever basic language arts materials (e.g., a textbook series) that may be in use.

Unfortunately, there is no available source of the kind of information on non-print materials that would help teachers select the most appropriate items from among the half-million-or-so non-print media titles that are currently available, or even from the estimated 25,000 titles that are most commonly held and used by schools in the United States and Canada. That is, there is no source of information on those instructional design characteristics of non-print media which would enable teachers to "fit" the materials they use into an integrated instructional design without going through the time-consuming and expensive process of previewing and analyzing the instructional design of each one. Those who select materials for purchase typically employ selection criteria that are too general for fitting those materials to particular classroom programs and even most local or regional catalogs do not contain enough essential instructional design information to make such decisions.

The Incredible Dependency on Materials

In regular classroom instruction in reading, mathematics, social studies, and science (at both elementary and secondary school levels) some 90-95 percent of classroom instructional time involves the use of some type of instructional material (EPIE Report 1977). Unfortunately this research based on data gathered from more than 12,000 teachers during the 1974-75 school years, does not provide very much information on how much of that 90-95 percent of classroom time (1) individual students spend actually attending to those aspects of the materials that are instructionally relevant to them as individuals at any given instructional moment, and (2) how instructionally relevant any given material is for any given learner at any given moment of instruction. Nevertheless, the reported percentage of materials' use time as calculated by more than 12,000 teachers and corroborated by independent observations of representative classrooms, does throw some important light on what until now has been an overlooked aspect of classroom activity. Yet despite the absence of empirical data regarding either actual learner time on task or the relevance of the materials being used to the actual instructional needs of individual learners, the survey does provide data that invite some reasonably strong inferences about whether the regular classroom teacher has either the time or the expertness (or, indeed, the freedom) required to choose and to prescribe those specific instructional materials which would result in an individual learner's working in a sustained manner on relevant learning tasks. These data have to do with what these 12,000 teachers have to say about teacher involvement, time, and training in relation to the selection and use of those which are most used by learners.

To begin with, 45 percent or almost half of all teachers who took part in this nationwide survey, reported that they *had not* been involved in the selection of the instructional materials that are most used in their classrooms. Second, the remaining 55 percent (those who had been involved in selecting their most-used materials) reported that on the average they had spent about *one hour* annually in selecting such materials. Finally, of this same 55 percent, less than half had received any training in the effective instructional use of the materials in question.

Analysis of Instructional Design

At the heart of EPIEs work with educators on program development and the selection of materials is the framework of instructional design which is used for describing the key elements of any educational program or setting.[4] The following diagram shows how the common language descriptions of design elements can be utilized to *analyze* various instructional processes and products which must often be considered separately so that they may be effectively *interrelated* in the process of program planning and development.

Part of the service to each district member of EPIEs network is training them in the analysis of instructional design, focused first on instructional materials (with a training approach we have been using with school staffs all over North America for the past three years) and then applied to all aspects of its program planning and development, including the interpretation of needs assessment and problem clarification, the consideration of program alternatives, and the organizing of in-service training efforts.

EPIE has developed its system of analysis (*EPIE form A*) over a period of eight years and has trained over 400 analysts in this country and Canada. To my knowledge it is the only program/product analysis system that has been developed

from an R & D-base and on which inter-analyst reliability research has been conducted.

A project recently undertaken by EPIE Institute and a national network of school districts, while not specifically designed to serve teachers of the handicapped, *is* aimed at creating the sort of thoroughly integrated approach to providing teachers with information on materials described above. This building-level information is being designed to enable teachers to interrelate the use of materials within their own classroom-developed instructional designs. Although this project is not aimed specifically at helping teachers to deal with the need of handicapped learners it would seem feasible to link its work to NIMIS and to employ it as a grass roots building-level extension of NCEMMHs work. The project as currently designed calls for going beyond the delivery of an integrated building-level materials information system to include a building-level/classroom-level in-service training package in Instructional Design Decision Making for classroom teachers. This aspect of EPIEs work might also be adapted to the need of teachers confronted with dealing with the P.L. 94-142-IEP question. But, as made painfully clear throughout this paper, the successful implementation of P.L. 94-142 in classrooms across the country is not going to be achieved simply by supplying teachers with information and training that may be useful to them in designing and carrying out the Individual Educational Plans called for in that Law. There are a number of necessary parallel developments that must also occur — each a large undertaking in and of itself. But each parallel strand must be accomplished if the full potential of P.L. 94-142 to help handicapped learners in United States classrooms is to be realized.

Kenneth Komoski, President of EPIE, wrote recently:

> It is one thing to note that the materials used with regular students in regular classrooms have not been evaluated, revised, and, if necessary, redesigned in order to better facilitate learning for such students. It is quite another matter that materials in use with special-education students having one or more specific handicaps are, by and large, no more carefully evaluated, revised, or adapted to meet the needs of such learners. Nevertheless, this was what I found to be largely the case as I talked with special-education teachers and examined materials in special-education classrooms and in district and regional instructional materials centers that served teachers in those classrooms.
>
> In most cases, I found shelves of materials that are currently being marketed for use in regular classrooms and teachers who were doing their best to adapt these materials to the specific needs of learners with specific handicaps. Occasionally, I found materials (mostly produced by the same two or three publishers) that had been developed specifically for use with the types of handicapped learners found in that class. This was clearly the exception rather than the rule. It goes without saying that what I observed does not bode well for the successful implementation of P.L. 94-142 in *regular* classrooms by *regular* teachers.[5]

The Need for a Breakthrough

This need is underlined by the fact that an estimated 90-plus percent[6] of the materials currently included in NIMIS (National Instructional Materials Information System), designed as an information resource for teachers of the handicapped, are in fact regular classroom materials that have not been designed for and developed on the basis of direct feedback from handicapped learners/users (or, for that matter, on the basis of direct feedback from learners/users of any sort).

We have a long way to go before a breakthrough in the selection and use of instructional materials can occur. For instance, it has been long taken-for-granted that in order to market educational products in certain states and large school districts that a payoff of some sort or another was in order. The recent indictments for bribery of a former commissioner of education in one large adoption state and the removal from office of specific members of the materials commission of another because of "conflicts of interest" has managed to "bulldoze" change in illegal and immoral patterns in those two states. But, in addition to the human greed that helped to establish those patterns, I think that those who were on the receiving end of those payoffs were able to find a handy rationalization which may have served to assuage their guilt — if, indeed, they felt any. The rationalization is that the teachers get what they deserve and the marketplace will respond to their desires if and when they get their act together.

Tyler and Klein discussed the phenomenon of "buyer beware" a few years back.[7] Nothing has changed. It has been espoused by a representa-

tive of one of the federally-sponsored educational laboratories that have been heavily involved in materials development during the last decade. His statement was made at a symposium dealing with minimum evaluative criteria for instructional products held at the 1976 convention of the American Educational Research Association. At that symposium, John E. Hopkins, Director of Planning and Evaluation, Research for Better Schools, Inc., took the position that as long as an instructional material is not found to be obviously harmful to learners (e.g., socially fair free of bias and stereotyping) ". . . there should be no further requirements, and the marketplace should simply be allowed to work its will."[8] Whether or not one agrees with this position, it is one that is obviously broadly held. But even if one were to accept it as valid, the position does not address the question being dealt with in this paper, which is that improvements in the evaluation of instructional materials can help to improve the quality of classroom instruction being received by individual handicapped learners. The "buyer beware" position simply fails to come to grips with the fact that there is a need to be concerned with the improvements of even those materials that have been "evaluated" positively on the basis of their having been accepted in the marketplace.

The question must sooner or later be asked as to whether learners are, in fact, able to learn from the material, no matter how marketable, and profitable, it may prove to be. This question is not answered as often as one might think. In fact, for most materials currently being used by learners, this question has never been asked or answered by those who are marketing (and, in most cases, who have developed) the material. This fact has been aphoristically underscored at the outset of the article, "The Trouble with Textbooks"[9] which points out the standard reason learners are not used by publishers in evaluating the effectiveness of their textbooks is the simple reason that "kids don't buy books, teachers do."

Earlier I referred to Bloom's recent book on what seems to work in schools. I find it noteworthy that Bloom points away from the school when he calls for vitally needed new research.

> How do individual temperament and home environmental conditions determine the ratios of success and failure experiences needed to provide positive affective (school) entry characteristics?[10]

I suspect the way in which parents will be involved with the instructional materials that play a part in the plans developed for 94-142 compliance will require our study. Kathy Brophy has recently completed a brilliant study of what children and parents think homework is in the early years of schooling.[11] Her findings encourage me to explore the use and abuse of "special" instructional materials by learners and parents *after* school.

The final question is whether people in this special area of education will take advantage of the opportunity to change the present reality regarding instructional materials, or will they — like so many others — continue to take both instructional materials and the reality that surrounds them for granted — the unchanged constant in our unsolved instructional equation.

---

[1] B. S. Bloom, *Human Characteristics and School Learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976.

[2] R. L. Wolf, "Surveying Users of Individualized Instruction Materials" ICE: Education School, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana (unpublished manuscript) 1975, p. 20.

[3] EPIE Institute gathers and disseminates information about the performance and the effectiveness of learning materials, equipment, and systems. It is a nonprofit independent agency. EPIE has no commercial sponsorship; its income is derived entirely from fees for services rendered to educational consumers and from occasional nonrestrictive grants from private foundations and public agencies.

[4] Educational Products Exchange (EPIE), 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. 10027.

[5] P. K. K. Komoski, "Instructional Materials: Products or Processes?" Paper delivered at Columbus, Ohio Symposium, July 1976.

[6] Private conversation with Director of National Institutional Materials Information Services, Ohio.

[7] L. L. Tyler and M. F. Klein, "Caveat Emptor: Let the (Educational) Buyer Beware," *Educational Technology*, 13, pp. 52-4, April 1973.

[8] J. E. Hopkins, "Criteria Acceptable to the Educational Developer," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April 26, 1976.

[9] E. Broudy, "The Trouble with Textbooks" *Teachers College Record*, 77, pp. 13-34, September 1975. *Harvard Educational Review*, 1967.

[10] First of five questions summarizing Chapter 4, pp. 107.

[11] K. Brophy, "Homework" Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL, 1977.

publishing for the handicapped learner

richard a. giesen
president
science research associates, inc.
chicago

The recently passed Public Law 94-142, the Education for all Handicapped Children Act, unequivocally supports the right of all handicapped children to a public education, encourages placement of handicapped children in regular classrooms with non-handicapped children, calls for instruction in accordance with an individualized education plan, and authorizes funds to assist local schools in meeting this additional responsibility.

In this unusually specific legislation, Congress mandated that local schools must accept responsibility for the education of all handicapped children. It directed that the individualized program be written by the local school, following state guidelines, and that it be adhered to for each learner. Then, because educating handicapped children can be very expensive, it authorized supplementary funds for the states and for local school districts.

To some degree, teachers have long responded to individual differences, recognizing that even in so-called homogeneous groupings there will be a range of differences in ability, physical and social maturity, interests and experience. With this legislation, Congress has further stretched the range of differences with which schools and teachers must cope.

That aspect of the law is of particular interest to Science Research Associates, Inc., because, for almost forty years, we have been publishing instructional materials designed to assist teachers in responding to the uniqueness of each child. Of more immediate importance, during the past three years, SRA has given particular attention to the special needs of handicapped learners.

Nevertheless, we found that although the need was great, the funds available were limited. No individual or publisher likes to ignore human need — especially the need of a visually handicapped or hearing-impaired child — but the realities of the publishing business made it difficult to respond to these special requests. Therefore, with its special funding, Public Law 94-142 offers educational publishers a new opportunity to respond to the needs of handicapped students.

The challenge of this legislation for educational publishers is both to adapt current materials and to devise totally new products for a special group of learners who will now be entering school for the first time or moving from special classrooms into the mainstream.

At SRA, we have been preparing to meet this challenge for some time, first through an independent assessment of our current publications, second by convening an invitational conference of leaders in special education to discuss the needs of these students, and, third, by organizing our publishing resources to respond in the light of our increased understanding of the needs of the handicapped. Yet, what we have been learning seems to have implications for the education of *all* young people, not just for the handicapped, in the years ahead.

SRAs efforts to give particular attention to needs of the handicapped began by our development of a working relationship with the staff of the National Center for Media and Materials for Education of the Handicapped at Ohio State University and with members of the special education department at the University of Wisconsin.

These two groups evaluated many of our publications — a variety of kits, tapes, workbooks, and manipulative devices — to show us how particular SRA programs would prove useful in special education. Our catalog will highlight materials that have been evaluated by independent experts in special education as being appropriate for these students.

The traditional prepublication evaluation of SRA materials through classroom experimentation will continue, of course, but those classroom tryouts will have the additional objective of determining whether we have provided sufficient range and reinforcement for various handicapped students.

Effective publishing requires communication with students and teachers. As we moved into publishing for handicapped learners, we felt a special need to deepen our own understanding through

face-to-face contact with leaders in special education. Consequently, last February we convened a conference of carefully selected practitioners and SRA staff members for more than a day of small group meetings organized around a series of questions from our editorial and management staff. In essence, we asked our staff members, "What would you like to ask experts in special education in order to better meet their needs?"

Conference leaders and participants included parents, teachers, school administrators, professors, and other specialists representing state, local, and federal agencies involved with meeting the educational needs of a broad range of handicapped individuals. The keynoter was Dr. Thomas Gilhool, chief counsel for the Public Interest Law Center of Philadelphia, who in 1972 represented the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Persons in its successful suit to secure a free public education for all mentally retarded persons.

We asked our conference participants to help us define the appropriate role of the publisher in meeting the needs of handicapped learners. They took that assignment seriously, providing us with a long list of recommendations which we are continuing to examine. They told us, for example, to include handicapped learners when we validate our testing programs, and to promote parent-child *enjoyment* in materials produced for use in homes, rather than placing the parent in a formal teaching role. They cautioned against special materials that isolate the handicapped from their peers.

Instructional materials may be low priority items in school budgets (less than 1 percent of total school budgets goes for materials of instruction), but our conference participants — experienced educators — know that they are high priority items for the teacher. Consequently, they responded generously to our request for advice and guidance. We are grateful to them.

From our meeting with that distinguished group of conferees and from continuing contact with our associates in Ohio and Wisconsin, we have developed a heightened sense of the potential of handicapped individuals and of our need and capacity to serve them. As Tom Gilhool has pointed out, the basic promise of the Constitution to all Americans consists of "independence and self-confidence, the feeling of creativity . . . lives of high spirits rather than hushed, suffocating silence." An important need, it now seems clear, is to generalize new notions of the rights of handicapped people — and indeed of all individuals — to ensure that that promise has greater reality for everyone. That's surely a challenging long-range goal.

More specifically, we developed appreciation for the extensive job of teacher training — perhaps the most massive teacher training effort the nation has ever witnessed — that lies ahead, as handicapped children move from special classrooms into the regular classroom. The requirement for an individualized education program codifies what has long been recognized as superior teaching practice, but it places almost unprecedented demands on the teacher.

SRAs invitational conference for the handicapped also increased our already considerable respect for the accomplishments of the parents of handicapped children who have final responsibility for day-to-day care as well as long-range personal development. As a result of the new legislation, these parents can expect to find additional help for their children in their local schools.

Since an individual education program may be one of the most significant aspects of this new legislation, it merits further discussion. But first, let me recall a little history.

In the past four decades, we have seen many educational trends emerge, mature, and decline. Because education is our major focus at SRA, we have responded in varying degrees to most of these trends. As a company, we joined the publishing scene when the progressive movement in education was fading. During the forties, with the introduction of the Kuder Interest Inventory and the Iowa Tests of Educational Development, we helped to shape the future of standardized testing. The Iowa Tests, for example, proved particularly effective in the fifties, when the National Defense Education Act spurred the high schools to the identification of students with potential in math and science — part of the national reaction to Sputnik. And almost fifteen years before Title IX, by the way, those test results were once more documenting the fact that math and science are not exclusive masculine domains.

Also in the fifties, SRA began publishing materials designed to meet the needs of *individual* learners and provide an alternative — or an addition — to lock-step, whole-group instruction. The SRA Reading Laboratory® kits provided perhaps the first effective way for a teacher to cope with a classroom full of children with a variety of learning rates, styles, and personal interests.

Meanwhile, some schools were experimenting

with learning centers or media resource centers — the concept took a number of names — and SRA provided ways to organize and operate these centers. We are told that our Learning Center manuals helped a great many teachers and students to fully utilize these facilities.

Today, the public interest has been caught by something called "back to basics," a trend that calls for increased concentration on mastery of basic reading and computation. At SRA, we have never abandoned our commitment to the mastery of basic skills by all students. We continue to believe that this can be accomplished best by understanding each individual student's needs and capabilities, not by returning to lock-step approaches of yesteryear.

To assist teachers in managing instruction of basic skills as well as broader aspects of the curriculum, SRA has just this year introduced its Learning Cycle manuals, which provide a system for an objective-based instructional approach for students of all ability levels.

Each of these trends arose from someone's determination to make teaching and learning more effective. Learning, as we at SRA have come to understand it, is rooted in the nature of the learner. In the final analysis it is an individual process — different in some ways for each of us. Whether the setting is an open classroom, a lecture hall, or a one-room schoolhouse; whether the source of knowledge is a teacher or a programed text, or the daily newspaper, each of us will learn in the light of our background, prior experience, interests, and even the physical condition we bring to the act of learning.

If we operate on that premise, then the exciting contribution of Public Law 94-142 is not the funding it promises but the requirement of an individualized education program for each handicapped learner. An individualized program helps us focus on the *potential* of the individual learner, rather than on some predetermined category of disability. (In seeking to hire the handicapped, industry and labor are learning to ask, "What can this person do?" as the only valid question.)

An individualized education program enables teachers to establish realistic goals for each child. It offers an instructional framework that has great potential: A cycle of diagnosis, prescription, instruction, and evaluation. And it calls for parent participation in carrying out the process.

Individualized instruction can have a liberating effect on teachers and students. But we have to face the fact that it also can be a burden to the teacher. Increased paperwork is required for record-keeping and reporting. Clearly, the teacher will need support and assistance. As the teacher develops confidence and expertise in developing and implementing individual programs for handicapped students, however, the question will almost surely arise: If individualized instruction is a sound approach for the needs and nature of the handicapped learner, is it any less desirable for *all* learners?

We, like many others, have come to the very reassuring conclusion that when we help handicapped people, we will also help people who are not handicapped. The truth of that principle is evident in the physical realm: cut the curb to accommodate a wheel chair and the person pushing a baby carriage will benefit. So will the bicyclist and someone moving a heavy load with a hand truck. Jim Jeffers of the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board recently commented, somewhat wryly, about the difficulty of finding room for his wheel chair on the new ramp at the Lincoln Memorial. "The walking crowd takes up all the room," he said. "They like the ramp better than all those steps."

In the same way, while captioned films make learning easier for the hearing-impaired child, they also reinforce the understanding of all other children.

The individualized education program, as required by P.L. 94-142, is designed to benefit handicapped children by reaffirming their own individual capabilities, an advantage that, hopefully, will be extended to their less handicapped classmates.

The "regular classroom teacher" — a clumsy designation that will have to serve for the moment — who finds one or more handicapped children "mainstreamed" into the classroom will understandably experience some initial distress and anxiety. Professional support, additional training, and appropriate teaching materials are essential during the transitional period. Given that admittedly large order, it seems almost certain that the logic of an individualized program for all students — the most gifted as well as the most handicapped — will become irresistible.

We used to talk about *exceptional* children, by which we meant those small groups at each end of the population curve. In the intense effort of recent years to obtain equity for handicapped children who were receiving no formal instruction

whatever, we seem to have abandoned the "exceptional" concept. It was a useful term and it would be a good one to revive.

We at SRA are still a long way from being experts in special education, but we have learned enough to be able to set goals for ourselves. We have developed some new ways of looking at our present products. Some will be easy to adapt: additions to the teachers' manuals may be all that is required. Some will need additional components to provide more practice and reinforcement for learners.

As materials are revised, we will be looking even more critically at type sizes, illustrations, and content itself. Do reading selections, for example, include stories about handicapped children? Is this filmstrip of broad enough value to warrant development of a captioned version? Would revision make these materials helpful to parents working with their children at home?

Most important, as we look at materials now in development or in the early stages of conceptualization, we have a new sense of direction that will keep us steadily aware of the needs of handicapped learners.

If interest and conviction were the only requirements, our materials could be adapted for handicapped learners immediately. However, there are constraints on publishers that librarians know very well. These constraints combine to slow our progress even when, as in this case, the goal is clear. Time passes as we seek permission to reprint or wait for original manuscript. More time passes as new materials are subjected to prepublishing evaluation and are again revised on the basis of teachers' and students' experiences in the classroom. There is, unfortunately, no shortcut to the development and publishing of quality instructional materials.

In the final analysis, what matters is that several million handicapped learners now have access to the educational opportunity so essential to their future independence. Devoted teachers will respond. Publishers have heard the message. They also will respond.

We at SRA are committed to working even harder than before to meet the needs of these students. But the best way we can do that is to continue our dialogue with you, who are closest to them. Please write to me at 259 East Erie Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611 and let me know your concerns and opinions. I promise that each of you who writes will receive a personal response. Your thoughts on this subject are quite important to all of us.

serving the exceptional child - a system response

karen gray
head, system services
and
cynthia altgilbers
interlibrary cooperation librarian
great river library system
quincy, illinois

Great River Library System is a multitype library system in West-Central Illinois committed to serving the needs of all its associated libraries. The eight-county area which GRLS serves is primarily rural, with two communities, Quincy and Jacksonville, over 10,000 in population. Twenty-two public libraries, thirty-six schools, five colleges, and four special libraries within the area belong to the system. Every public and private high school in the area has been affiliated with the system for at least one year.

GRLS began accepting school libraries as members of the system in April 1975. In order to limit potential service points to a manageable number and to serve that audience which could benefit most from the existing GRLS collection,

only high school libraries were approached for affiliation. However, these schools have the option of utilizing the GRLS and Illinois Library Materials Network (ILLINET) collections for elementary students if the high school librarian is willing to accept responsibility for ordering and return of materials. In order to access ILLINET, students and faculty in schools affiliated with GRLS contact their school librarian. The school librarian mails or telephones requests directly to GRLS after checking to see that the materials are not otherwise available locally. The requests may be filled from the system collection, the collection of the Quincy Public Library, or from one of the Research and Reference collections of ILLINET: the Illinois State Library, University of Illinois, Chicago Public Library, Southern Illinois University, University of Chicago, Northwestern University, or John Crerar Library. When materials are found they are sent directly to the school, usually for a one month loan period. Most materials are delivered by the United States mail since most of the GRLS area is served overnight from the system headquarters in Quincy.

Access to the GRLS and Quincy Public Library collections and the rest of ILLINET was the first service offered to the schools and remains the most used service. Initially, only interlibrary loan service for curriculum-related materials was offered to schools, but a rethinking of student and faculty needs and the system's service responsibility prompted a change to nonrestricted (in terms of subject matter) interlibrary loan service. Subsequently, other system services have been offered to schools including long-term loan of selected system materials, brochures and bibliographies, and a coordinated service program (CORE).

All librarians have a responsibility for providing library service to every individual in their service community. Therefore, the responsibility of the school library extends to the blind and physically handicapped students. The system can be a major source of materials for the handicapped as children getting acquainted with their world, as students fulfilling class assignments, and as young adults beginning to establish life styles and philosophies. The school librarian, as well as the public librarian, is beginning to recognize that the needs of handicapped people are special *only* in regard to format.

On the other hand, the provision of library materials for gifted students is also the librarian's responsibility. These individuals, whose interests often range beyond the "normal" curriculum-oriented library materials and fiction selected for the "average" students, have often been shortchanged by both the small school library and the small public library. The needs of these students can now be met by the local school library as a result of affiliation with Great River Library System.

Since its establishment, the system has served exceptional students through public libraries. However, with the inclusion of the schools in system membership, requests for materials for exceptional students cover a broader range of application and are more often technical in nature. Requests for materials are received from school faculty who are professionally trained in specialized education, from non-specialized faculty and librarians working with exceptional students, and from the students themselves. Materials requested range from theoretical research-oriented works to practical and specific teaching materials to high interest-low vocabulary fiction.

Although GRLS has always responded to all requests from the adult and juvenile public, the inclusion of schools has caused an increase in the number of requests for special students received at the system. This is because students and faculty now may request materials from a library more convenient in time and place, and are more aware of library services because of system and local library public relations efforts. This has necessitated a change in the system's acquisition of materials. GRLS now purchases more materials specifically geared to faculty dealing with handicapped students, more materials for advanced students, particularly in the sciences, and more variety in non-print media. In addition, by monitoring school requests, the system is able to purchase for its own collection or to recommend to local libraries specific titles or subjects frequently requested.

The Blind and Physically Handicapped

As a subregional library for the blind and physically handicapped, GRLS is able to offer talking books to visually handicapped students. This federally sponsored program provides talking book records, cassette tapes, and playback equipment to eligible readers. Public librarians in the GRLS area make the contacts with potentially eligible students and explain the talking book program. These students can be identified more readily by the school librarian and referred to the public librarian for talking book service.

Classrooms are eligible for talking book

registration if one or more students are visually or physically handicapped. A state and federally funded community counseling center with help from private sources provides a classroom for handicapped children in conjunction with the public school district. The children wait eagerly for each month's issue of "Ranger Rick" which comes to their classroom on a flexible disc through the talking book program.

Specialized education consultants in school districts are kept informed by public librarians about the talking book program and other services and materials which are useful in special education — such as toys, games, puzzles, and professional reading. The GRLS bibliography "Talking Books With Print Books for Children" contains materials especially geared to handicapped children in the lower grades.

A visually-handicapped six-year-old read talking books during the summer and found that his books were helpful to him in the fall at school. His regular classroom was registered for talking books, and his teacher ordered materials for him to coordinate with teaching units. The school district supplied funds to buy commercially prepared cassette tapes to supplement what was available through the talking book program.

Large print books can be borrowed from the system by any library for use by the visually impaired.

The Slow Learner or Unmotivated Student

GRLS has an extensive collection of records and cassettes including popular and classical music, lectures, plays, poetry, and readings of books. The cassettes in particular have been used with slow learners or with those who are indifferent to traditional teaching.

At least one teacher in the GRLS area has found his students to be eager to listen to cassettes of novels. Most of these students would never read *For Whom The Bell Tolls*, for instance, but are attentive to cassette readings and retain an understanding of important works to which they would not otherwise be exposed.

GRLS' juvenile collection is used by librarians who request nonfiction for high school students with low reading levels. The thoughtful librarian can provide easy materials for students with learning difficulties without offending sensitive egos if the material comes from outside the school. Books listed in the GRLS brochure "High Interest-Low Vocabulary Books for Adults" are also requested by librarians and teachers for use with slow learners.

The Gifted Student

GRLS responds to the needs of gifted students through the loan of research-oriented materials from the system collection, other area libraries, and ILLINET.

One school librarian pointed out that in the small community neither the school nor the public library can afford to provide materials within the range or scope of the brightest students. These students are encouraged by their teachers to work beyond the average student level of competency. When materials are not readily available gifted students become disinterested and bored. With fairly rapid access to larger library collections, students retain their enthusiasm for exploring in science and and technology, literature and the arts.

Another school librarian pointed out that the science department in her rural school district encourages talented students to pursue science projects of a technical nature. These students compile bibliographies of research materials which are obtainable at only the largest libraries in the state. Because of access to ILLINET these materials are available to the student through his small school library. Prior to the advent of system services, these students drove 30 miles or more to a university to use materials.

In another case, a high school student is planning a two-year investigation of the Arthurian legend, using interlibrary loan as her main source of materials.

Homebound Students

Fourteen public libraries offer home delivery of library materials to those unable to visit the public library in person. These workers can deliver regular library materials, large print books, cassettes and records, talking books, and curriculum-oriented materials to temporarily or permanently homebound students. The homebound library services are partly funded by GRLS with special state funds.

Mentally Retarded Students

GRLS has distributed an extensive bibliography

of "Books For Mentally Retarded Children" which can be borrowed from the system for use with educable or trainable mentally retarded children.

Exceptional Learning Experiences for All Students

Classroom teachers have requested GRLS materials to enrich their teaching units in order to provide unique learning experiences.

One student, a nonreader, was prompted to try his hand at carpentry by the Foxfire books borrowed from GRLS by his teacher. His first project was an ox yoke; he subsequently read the other Foxfire books and the Little House books searching for similar craft projects.

Art teachers can share expensive art books with students to supplement their textbooks. Music students can now hear different performances of the same work, as well as works not in their school collection, to enhance their appreciation of the classics.

Continuing Education

School faculty have GRLS and ILLINET collections to assist them in achieving higher levels of training in working with exceptional children. Teachers and administrators enrolled in extension courses at universities rely on local school and public libraries to fill requests for materials needed for research and classwork.

A primary grade teacher seeking an advanced degree in teaching reading to exceptional children has used GRLS to tap *Educational Research Information Clearinghouse* (ERIC) for information in her subject specialty.

Serving the Exceptional Child — The Future

All indications based on recent growth patterns point to increased requests from school librarians for materials for exceptional students in all categories. Great River Library System will respond with a careful analysis of requests as the basis for purchasing materials required to supplement the collection of the school library.

If there is an increase in system funding, the GRLS board will consider grants to school libraries for the purchase of library reference materials to aid the process of interlibrary loan and for general nonfiction titles. More extensive consultant services from system headquarters will be offered to school libraries to assist in long-range planning to serve all segments of the school community.

GRLS staff, school librarians, and faculty will continue to meet to explore better ways to serve the exceptional child.

national instructional materials information system (nimis)

carl f. olsen
assistant director for information services of the national center on educational media and materials for the handicapped
ohio state university
columbus, ohio

Background

The National Instructional Materials Information System (NIMIS) has been designed and implemented by the National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped (NCEMMH) in conjunction with the Area Learning Resource Centers (ALRCs) and the Specialized Offices (SO's). NCEMMH, the ALRCs, and the SO's are part of the Learning Resource Center system of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, United States Office of Education. The United States is divided into thirteen regions; each region has an ALRC. There are four Specialized Offices, S1, Specialized Office for the Visually Impaired; S2, Specialized Office for the Hearing Impaired; S3, Specialized Office for Other Handicaps; and S4, Specialized Office for Materials Distribution.

First Such National System

In the past, various agencies and individuals have developed information systems which were

Portions of this article have appeared in previous publications.

New Address for NIMIS

National Information Center for Special Education Media (NICSEM)
University of Southern California
University Park
Los Angeles, CA 90007
213-746-6681

designed to serve those who worked with handicapped learners within given states or regions. Many of these systems have worked well independently; however, until now there has been no nationally coordinated system for identifying materials and for the sharing of common information across regional and state boundaries. The creation of NIMIS is a positive step towards obtaining, organizing, storing, and retrieving this information in a manner which is most useful, cost efficient, and accessible to the target users.

Description

NIMIS is a supplemental and backup computer-based on-line interactive retrieval system specifically developed for the purpose of assisting teachers, parents, and other educators in locating information about instructional materials in the field of special education where local resources do not presently exist. An interactive retrieval system enables an individual to converse with a computer, asking questions and getting immediate answers. The answers will be given in the form of abstracts that list bibliographic information. These abstracts will be accessed on computer terminals throughout the United States on an instantaneous basis during the computer's hours of operation. Each NIMIS entry will include, where pertinent, items of identifications such as the following: author, title, publisher, price, abstract-description. See sample entry at the end of this article.

Four Types of Materials Are Included

NIMIS provides descriptive information concerning over 35,000 instructional media and materials for a nationwide audience. The system now contains information on four major types of materials:

Child-use instructional materials — materials used by the child (or by the teacher and child interacting) in the process of education, instruction, and evaluation.

Teacher training materials — instructional materials used to train or assist teachers or teachers-to-be in the selection, utilization, design, or adaptation of media, materials, and educational technology (such as how to operate instructional devices).

Evaluation materials — materials designed to evaluate, measure, and diagnose the current skills of a handicapped child.

Prototype materials — materials of an experimental or one-of-a-kind nature that have been developed as models for possible future development.

About three-fourths of the entries are for nonprint materials such as instructional kits, films, video cassettes, filmstrips, games, toys, or transparencies.

The educational media and materials with which NIMIS is concerned are intended to provide assistance for a wide range of individuals with handicaps in learning, including:

- visual impairment
- hearing impairment
- speech and language impairment
- mental retardation
- behavior disorders
- learning disabilities
- physical disabilities
- other health impairment
- multihandicapping conditions

Many children use the materials in a variety of educational settings:

- children attending private schools
- institutionalized children with severe handicapping conditions
- children receiving public school education supplemented with special training, tutoring, therapy, etc.
- children ranging in age from preschool to young adult.

How Materials Get into NIMIS

(1) Specialized Offices 1, 2, and 3 prepare the abstracts of child use materials to be entered into NIMIS. In order to prepare these abstracts, they have examined thousands of items of media and materials. After identifying the materials, they then classify, describe, and encode them, and send the entries for NIMIS to NCEMMH, where they can be entered into the data base. (2) NCEMMH coordinates the development of common standards and procedures for the SO's and ALRCs to use in their work of identifying and collecting the encoded information and entering it into the data base.

A person does not need to use a NIMIS terminal to gain access to the information in the NIMIS computer, however, because NCEMMH disseminates the information nationwide in the form of printed bibliographies that are updated periodically. NCEMMH sends these NIMIS bibliographies to about 800 local learning resource centers so

that teachers, parents, and others can use NIMIS information close to home.

How to Get Answers from NIMIS

Teachers or parents should first contact their local, metropolitan, or state learning resource center. Appropriate instructional materials or information about instructional materials may be available from them. If not, persons at these centers can initiate a search for the information in NIMIS in one of several ways, such as by consulting printed NIMIS bibliographies as they are available locally, or by contacting a nearby Area Learning Resource Center (ALRC) with a NIMIS terminal. For the State of Illinois please contact:

Illinois Resource and Dissemination Network (IRDN)
Illinois Office of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777
(217) 782-4433

Five Key Items to Obtain Information

In order to make a thorough search, five specific items of information are necessary:

1. *Educational level of material needed.* For example, are the students for whom the material is needed in kindergarten, or in junior high school? In some cases, a distinction needs to be made between grade level and functional level. For example, a child in junior high school may function at fourth grade level. The teacher must phrase the request carefully in order to get information about materials suitable for a fourteen-year-old child who reads like a nine-year-old fourth grader.
2. *Curricular area or general content area.* Examples: langauge arts, history, or science.
3. *Specific concepts or skills in that area.* Examples of specific skills in language arts: handwriting (such as cursive writing, left-handed writing, manuscript writing, etc.).
4. *Format of materials needed.* NIMIS will contain information on materials in more than sixty different non-print formats, such as audio tapes, captioned films, filmstrips, games, kits, slides, and video tapes.
5. *Disability or handicapping condition.* NIMIS will contain information on materials concerned with more than twenty-five exceptionalities and dysfunctions, e.g., learning disabilities, physical handicaps, blindness, deafness, and speech handicaps.

NIMIS Searches: What the ALRC Can Do for the Local Learning Resource Center

First, the ALRC can conduct a NIMIS search and can provide a copy of abstracts like the one shown here.

Second, the ALRC can help locate the material described in the abstract. If it is not available locally, the ALRC will contact Specialized Office 4 to try to obtain copies of the material.

Third, if the teacher is not familiar with how to use materials in a particular format, the local learning resource center or the ALRC can be called upon for assistance.

Thesaurus of Descriptors

Access to information stored in NIMIS is gained through special indexing terms called descriptors, such as those used in the representative entry shown here. These terms are very important in the retrieval process. There are more than eight hundred descriptors. So that people who often use NIMIS can more accurately formulate their requests, a list of every NIMIS descriptor appears in a publication called *Instructional Materials Thesaurus for Special Education,* third edition. Educators who plan to use NIMIS frequently should purchase a copy of the thesaurus. Available for $2 from the Ohio State University Press, 2070 Neil Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210.

Representative NIMIS Abstract

(Abridged from an actual entry)

Author/Corporate Author. Developmental Learning Materials.
Title. Same or different color cards.
Publication Information. Niles, Illinois, Developmental Learning Materials 1971.
Price. $1.40.
Abstract Description. "Same or Different Color Cards" is designed to teach recognition of variance or similarity of color in different forms and objects. This material can be used to develop perceptual motor skills, shape identification, matching, and the learning of color names. The set consists of 30 cards which measure 2¾" x 4½" and feature pairs of 15 items which stress color difference and likeness. The material is suggested for use at the readiness and grade 1 levels. A sheet of teacher information is included with the materials. LGG. 11-75.

Evaluation Information . . .

Evidence shows that this material is currently being used by teachers in educational programs for the educable mentally handicapped, the emotionally disturbed, the learning disabled, and multiply handicapped. . . .

Media Format. Picture cards.

Descriptors. Instructional, NIMIS, perceptual motor learning, likenesses differences, visual discrimination, classification, early childhood, kindergarten, grade 1, verbal response, visual, manual, independent, sequential approach, educable mentally handicapped, emotionally disturbed, learning disabled, trainable mentally handicapped, multiply handicapped, physically handicapped, speech handicapped.

OCLC Number. 1909091*

Preparation Sourse. 003-005 149 NCH*

Accession Number. In 003-316 NCH*

* The OCLC number is a control number assigned by the Ohio College Library Center to each NIMIS abstract. The preparation source number tells where the abstract was prepared. A NIMIS accession number is assigned by NCEMMH to every abstract entered into NIMIS.

exceptional child education resources: a one-of-a-kind data base

donald k. erickson
assistant executive director
of the council for exceptional children
reston, virginia

How often have you succumbed to a feeling of confusion, frustration, or even a case of the "mads" when attempting to select an appropriate data base to help locate needed information? If you have done any searching at all in the last couple of years, I suspect that you have known all of these emotions and perhaps more!

It's no wonder. Dr. Martha Williams of the University of Illinois Information Retrieval Research Laboratory reports[1] that there is a dramatic growth phenomenon presently occurring in the number of available data bases and data base services. Quoting statistics published in October 1976, Dr. Williams cites the existence of 277 machine readable bibliographic data bases worldwide (58 percent of them developed in the United States), containing 52 million records (89 percent of the records were in the United States data bases). Laconically she goes on to state that since those statistics were compiled she has become aware of 200 *more* bibliographic data bases bringing the total to almost 500! These statistics certainly support the notion that we have a right to be confused when trying to select a data base to use for a particular purpose.

Within this large and exploding universe of data bases comparatively few are specifically related to the field of education. Fortunately this reduces some of the confusion and frustration for those of us who work exclusively in that field of endeavor. However, there are still choices to be made. Will it be ERIC? NTIS? AIM/ARM? SSCI? Psych. Abstracts? SSIE? or ECER? . . . ECER?? What is ECER?

I was delighted with the invitation to describe to the readership of *Illinois Libraries* just one of the data bases that make up the statistics presented above. I have been asked to identify the unique aspects of ECER[2] (*Exceptional Child Education Resources)* and to point out those features which make it different from all other education data bases. In so doing, I will also describe the major information products and services which permit access to the ECER data base.

ECER is a privately owned, special interest, 25,000 record data base developed and maintained by The Council for Exceptional Children of Reston, Virginia. It is the only data base whose content focuses exclusively and comprehensively on the professional literature related to the education of all exceptional children — gifted and handicapped. But before I proceed with more detail on the data

base itself, let me provide some historical and comparative information on the development of this specialized information resource.

Background of CEC Information Services

It is a well documented fact that the 1960s was the decade for the beginning of many education related data bases in the United States. Perhaps the most widely known and used of these is the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) program, which marks its inception in 1965 and the establishment of the first ten ERIC Clearinghouses in June 1966. Concurrent with the appearance of the ERIC system and, to a large degree as a direct outgrowth of that event, The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) planted the CEC Information Center in the education landscape in June of 1966. Since then the CEC Information Center has played at least two major roles.

First, although the CEC Information Center was not initially funded by the ERIC Program[3], it has served as the ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children since 1966. In this role it has performed all the normal functions of an ERIC Clearinghouse including the input of exceptional child education literature citations to the ERIC publications, *Resources in Education* (RIE) and *Current Index to Journals in Education* (CIJE). These citations are naturally a part of the total ERIC data base and will be retrieved when searching that data base.

Second, under the terms and conditions of its initial grant from BEH, the CEC Information Center was to be far more encompassing than other ERIC Clearinghouses were then permitted to be. BEH,[4] with strong philosophical support from CEC, wanted to establish a "comprehensive" information program. From the beginning the CEC Information Center was committed to:

1. View as its audience any person who might have an interest in the education of handicapped and gifted[5] children, including teachers, administrators, researchers, psychologists, students, parents, legislators, and other related professional and paraprofessional personnel.
2. Document the entire range of professional literature in the subject area whether it was published or unpublished, copyrighted or uncopyrighted, fugitive or accessible. This included all relevant periodical literature, curriculum guides, program reports, guidelines and descriptions, textbooks, books by and for parents, course manuals, research and statistical reports, and many others.
3. Develop an array of information products and services that would do justice to the comprehensive coverage of the subject area and also address the information needs of the diverse audiences.

To summarize this section permit me to make the following observations:

1. CEC, with USOE and NIE grants and contracts, has been the sole operator of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children since 1966. In carrying out the functions of that project, CEC has been the primary contributor to the ERIC literature data base in the area of educating handicapped and gifted children.
2. CEC, during the same period of time that it was operating the ERIC project, developed the CEC Information Center, which has now been incorporated into the CEC Information Services and Publications Unit. This is a major organizational component at CEC which performs the functions of data base development; information services; training in the use of information services; and information products, publications, and periodicals. The ERIC Clearinghouse is a project within the Information Services and Publications Unit.

In terms of data base content, ECER includes all citations submitted to the ERIC system on educating handicapped and gifted children plus items that go beyond the ERIC scope. At the present time this includes copyrighted documents, dissertations, and non-print media whose focus is the education of exceptional children. These additional features are what make ECER different from ERIC. The comprehensive coverage of this specific special interest area sets it apart from all other data bases. It is important to keep these distinctions in mind when selecting a data base for searching on computerized retrieval systems. If you are looking for information on any aspect of the education of handicapped and/or gifted children, you will always get more comprehensive coverage if you use the ECER data base.

ECER Acquisitions Policy and Procedures

It is the policy of CEC Information Services *to acquire selected professional materials that relate to or are concerned with the education of handicapped and gifted children and youth.* The terms in this policy statement are explained in the following paragraphs:

- *acquire selected . . .*
  The CEC Information Center locates, obtains, and examines literature on the education of handicapped and gifted children and youth. All documents received are reviewed and screened before their selection for entry in the CEC data base. Data base entries must satisfy the requirements specified in this acquisitions policy statement.
- *professional materials . . .*
  Documents may be of a print or non-print nature including books, monographs, research reports, literature guides, curriculum guides, program descriptions, journal articles, pamphlets, newsletters, films, cassettes, filmloops, filmstrips, videotapes, and other related materials. Instructional materials for use by children are not included.
- *that relate to or are concerned with . . .*
  Documents are considered for review if their content has implications for the education of handicapped and gifted children and youth. The document may be pertinent to: (a) other professions such as medicine, law, architecture, psychology, and social work; (b) other educational mission areas such as early childhood, disadvantaged children, vocational and career education, physical education, and recreation; and (c) other curricular areas such as reading, mathematics, social studies, and science.
- *education and training . . .*
  Activities in the Information Center focus on the education of handicapped and gifted children. Acquisitions sought concern theory, research, programs, practice, and teacher education related to this focus. Acquisitions should deal with topics such as instruction, counseling and guidance, administration of programs and services, preparation of professional and paraprofessional personnel (preservice and inservice), support services, institutional placement and deinstitutionalization, federal and state law, policy and the legislative process, litigation, incidence and statistical information, professional organizations, and information for parents which will be beneficial in the educational planning for and placement of their handicapped and gifted children and youth. The acquisitions program also covers the literature on child abuse and neglect.
- *handicapped and gifted children and youth . . .*
  Handicapped and gifted (exceptional) children and youth are those individuals (a) who deviate from the normal in cognitive, sensory, affective, physical, and behavioral domains, or (b) who require a program of special education services including instructional materials, special teaching methodology, specially trained personnel in a day school program (special class, resource room, consulting teacher program, regular class placement, diagnosis and treatment center), special school, residential or private school, hospital, or home instruction setting.

Eleven years of operation have helped CEC to establish a fairly fixed set of procedures for carrying out the acquisitions policy. Yet we are constantly seeking to identify either overlooked or new resources that will contribute to the comprehensiveness of our acquisitions program. Major sources that are regularly examined and/or contacted for both published and unpublished documents include: *Publishers Trade List Annual; Books in Print;* publishers' announcements and product lists; published bibliographies; and publication lists from various sources — state departments of education (divisions of special education); rehabilitaton and mental health agencies; local education agencies; agency, project, and organizational newsletters; subscription agencies; University presses; special education R & D Centers; federally sponsored programs, projects, and networks; professional organizations; and selected conferences and conventions.

Other procedures are also employed in an attempt to find the "hard to locate" or fugitive type literature. These include targeted direct mail solicitation; direct personal contact with specific organizations, agencies, projects, or individuals; "Call for Documents" in selected journals; and open invitations at special meetings and workshops. We also attempt to capitalize on the good will of "informants" who are members of the many informal communication networks that exist in the various areas of our total scope.

The building of a comprehensive data base is a complex, continuing, and never completed task. We have given this function a high priority and believe that ECER is not only a unique data base but one of high quality which cannot be overlooked or ignored when resources on the education of handicapped and gifted children are being sought.

ECER Products and Services

By now I hope that I have been able to convey the significant differences that exist between the content of the ECER data base and the content

of any of the other data bases that are available to you either on- or off-line in the United States. If I have accomplished that purpose, I can only conclude that you will want to know how to use it. The remainder of this article describes briefly the major tools that are available for providing access to ECER.*

Exceptional Child Education Resources

Exceptional Child Education Resources (formerly known as *Exceptional Child Education Abstracts*, ECEA) is the print presentation of the ECER data base. ECER, a quarterly publication in its ninth volume year, contains all citations entered in the data base. Every citation, including journal articles, give author, title, source, publication date, availability and/or ordering data, descriptors, and an abstract or descriptive summary of the document or article. Each issue of ECER has a subject, author, and title index for that issue. The fourth issue of each volume year contains a cumulative index for the entire volume year. Beginning with Volume 9, No. 1 (Spring 1977), two new sections were added to ECER. One section lists recently completed doctoral dissertations in special education. The second section contains a listing of non-print resources that are directly applicable to the training of special education personnel.

Custom Computer Searches

CEC maintains the capability to do on-line interactive computer searching of the entire ECER data base. Of all the data base access tools employed, the computer search permits the quickest, most accurate and up-to-date location of data. The searching package used allows full text searching of all relevant fields including the abstract. The computer file is updated with new citations eight times a year and consequently is always more current than any other resource. To ensure the most efficient use of this powerful tool CEC has installed a toll free telephone number (800-336-3728) and strongly suggests that any person who wants a computer search done call and negotiate the search with one of CECs information specialists. These specialists have a comprehensive knowledge of the data base and are aware of the best searching strategies for locating the information you want.

In addition to the ECER data base, CEC can conduct searches of all other on-line educational data bases.

Topical Bibliographies

There are times when the most up-to-the-minute information is not essential but a good overview of a subject area is important. In these cases a topical bibliography will often meet the need quite nicely. To meet this need CEC has developed a series of 66 different bibliography titles, each one of which addresses a specific area of concern. Each bibliography contains the most relevant citations on the topic area. They are drawn directly from the ECER data base. The printed bibliography citations include author, title, publication date, source, availability, descriptors, and an abstract or descriptive summary. Most bibliographies are updated on an annual basis. New titles are added to the series as needed and unused ones are dropped. Sample titles from the current (1976) bibliography series include:

- Attitudes toward the Handicapped
- Child Abuse
- Mainstreaming — General
- Early Childhood Identification
- Learning Disabilities — Secondary Level
- Gifted — Teaching Methods/Curriculum/Teacher Training

Selective Dissemination of Information (SDI)

The SDI is a relatively new addition to the information services provided by CEC. Its purpose is to automatically and regularly provide current awareness of all literature acquired in specific topic areas on a subscription basis. An SDI subscriber receives eight computer print-outs a year. Each print-out contains citations (title, author, publication date and source, availability data, descriptors, and a 200 word abstract) of every item acquired in the subject area since the last print-out. Twenty-one different topic areas have been selected by CEC and are available on an SDI basis.

Use of Resource Library

CEC maintains a noncirculating resource library at its headquarters in Reston, Virginia. This library contains the "hard copy" of every document entered in the ECER data base as well as current issues of periodicals that are scanned for appropriate articles to be included in the data base. All journal articles cited in the ECER data base and the entire ERIC data base are available in microfiche. All standard library reference tools are also available. The public is encouraged to use this resource.

A Final Comment

As an organization, The Council for Exceptional Children has been very much a part of the rapid growth and development of the information industry which has occurred during the past 10 to 15 years. The ECER data base and related services described in this article are evidence of that involvement. But long before computers, data bases, on-line searching systems, batch modes, and inverted files were a part of our vocabulary, CEC had made a firm commitment to the discovery, transmission, and dissemination of information that would lead to more effective educational programs for handicapped and gifted children. Founded in 1922, CEC has a 55-year history of seeking and discovering new and creative ways of advancing the education of all exceptional children. The ECER data base services are only a part of the total information services of CEC. And the extensive information services provided by the organization are only a portion of the total program of the organization. I invite you to discover and participate in this one-of-a-kind resource.

[1] Martha E. Williams, "Education and Training for On-Line Use of Data Bases" (paper presented at the EUSIDIC Conference in Graz, Austria, December 1, 1976).

[2] Until the spring of 1977 the *Exceptional Child Education Resources* data base was known as *Exceptional Child Education Abstracts* (ECEA) in both machine and print sources. This change is explained later in the paper but since my purpose is to reduce confusion I thought I would remove this mystery early. ECEA is now ECER.

[3] From 1966 until 1976 the CEC Information Center received funding from USOEs Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH). From 1974 to 1976 this funding was gradually reduced to zero since CEC has assumed most of the support that had been provided by BEH. It should also be pointed out that since 1974 CEC has had an NIE contract for continued operation of the ERIC Clearinghouse component of the Information Center program.

[4] The CEC Information Center was established and funded approximately six months before the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped was created. Thus, to be absolutely accurate, the early funding for the center came from the Handicapped Children and Youth branch which was housed in USOEs Bureau of Research.

[5] By legislative mandate, BEH could not provide funding for activities in the area of the gifted. CEC itself supplemented the early federal grant in order to assure that the gifted would be included. In recent years NIE has contributed to the support of this content area.

[6] If you would like to receive additional information about any of the ECER products and services, please address your inquiry to the author, Director, CEC Information Services and Publications, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091.

growth and impact of the association for special education technology

john j. opperman
president
association for special education technology
cleveland, ohio

On April 15, 1972, the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) officially accepted the petition of a newly formed special interest group and the Association for Special Education Technology (ASET) was created. From an original membership of 35 persons in 1972, it has grown to a membership approaching 400. Likewise, the extent of ASETs services and involvements has also increased significantly. ASETs goals and objectives, however, have remained constant and are as appropriate today as they were four and one-half years ago when ASET was founded. Briefly, ASET is applying its combined strengths and resources to:

1. facilitate improvements and adaptations of instructional materials for use with handicapped students,
2. stimulate development of new technologies with the field of special education,
3. identify and publicize the unique instructional needs of handicapped learners,
4. foster cooperation among special education and instructional technology interest groups,
5. encourage the development and production of effective instructional materials and media,
6. promote improved federal legislation for instructional technology in special education.

While caution should be observed to avoid any negative effects of "labeling," the term "handicapped children" is generally used to refer to children who have been classified as mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically or other health impaired,

or children with specific learning disabilities who require, due to the nature of their handicap, special education or related services.

Special education programs and related services for handicapped children have developed quite slowly until recent years. Many children in the past have been denied the right to an education commensurate with their special needs and abilities. Over the past few years, however, there have been numerous changes within the field of special education. Both litigation and legislation at state and federal levels have extended the parameters of special education to encompass *all* children with special needs regardless of the severity of their handicap. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142) has mandated that no handicapped child in the United States be denied the opportunity for an appropriate education. In addition, according to P.L. 94-142, for each handicapped child there shall be a written individualized education program (IEP). The implications for appropriate and effective utilization of media, materials, and technology within the implimentation of this IEP are profound.

Another factor which has influenced the field of special education is the tremendous growth in the number and complexity of instructional materials and media on the market and the commensurate growth of the technology-related aspects in the process of providing handicapped children with an appropriate education. Effective use of this mushrooming availability of instructional media is a critically important element in the provision of an individualized education program.

With a membership comprised of special and general educators, learning resource center staff, administrators, researchers, university teacher training personnel, commercial producers, and students, ASET has an exceptionally broad range of professional personnel involved in the field of special education. In its four and one-half years of existence as a national affiliate of AECT, ASET has directed its energies and resources toward the major goal of improving the utilization of instructional technology with the special student in a variety of ways. The many services provided by ASET contribute to the achievement of this goal.

Specifically, ASET disseminates information and new ideas regarding special education technology through its quarterly newsletter *ASET Report*. Members are kept informed of new legislation, innovative instructional materials and media, R & D projects, and other such information which contributes to balanced professional growth. Utilizing its own resources as well as a budget allocation from AECT, ASET is currently conducting a study to determine the feasibility of developing a *Journal of Special Education Technology*. This proposed journal would strengthen and expand the information dissemination services currently provided by *ASET Report*.

Another way in which information is disseminated is through ASETs participation in the AECT convention. In addition to a full day of its own programming, ASET also participates cooperatively with other national affiliates and divisions in shared convention programs. ASET is also actively involved in determining ways in which the special needs of handicapped persons can be accommodated while attending the AECT convention. As an example, ASET originally used a considerable portion of its convention funds to provide interpreters for hearing handicapped persons attending the AECT convention. It is encouraging to note that AECT has now assumed that responsibility and includes interpreting services within its regular convention programming.

Another example of the mutually supportive relationship between ASET and AECT working together toward the goal of improving the utilization of instructional technology was demonstrated in a resolution passed by both ASETs membership and the AECT Board of Directors during their meetings at the AECT Convention in Anaheim in April 1976. That resolution states: "ASET and AECT endorse the concept of an appropriate education for all handicapped children as required in The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142) and recommend to the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, United States Office of Education, that the requirement for an individualized education program for each handicapped child be explicated in the rules and regulations for implementation for the Act to include provisions for the application of media, materials, and educational technology as an integral part of that individualized program."

With this cooperative spirit and clarity of purpose ASET will continue to apply its many and varied resources toward the improvement of educational opportunities for all handicapped children through the effective and appropriate utilization of instructional media, materials, and technology. Indeed, a new era has dawned in the field of special education. ASET will focus its energies to ensure that this growth in programs, services, and

instructional technology has a maximum beneficial impact upon the education of each and every handicapped child.

Additional information regarding ASET may be obtained by contacting the author at the Cleveland Hearing and Speech Center, 11206 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44106, (216) 231-8787.

national center of educational media and materials for the handicapped program

New Address

LINC Services, Inc.
829 Eastwind Drive
Westerville, OH 43081
614-890-8200

victor e. fuchs
assistant director of the former national center
on educational media and materials
for the handicapped
columbus, ohio

> If we had paid no more attention to our plants than we have to our children, we would now be living in a jungle of weeds.
>
> —Luther Burbank

According to estimates (Bureau of Education for the Handicapped) there are about eight million learners within the ages of 0-19 in the United States and its territories who can be considered handicapped and require some type of special education service. At the present time approximately 54 percent of these handicapped learners are receiving some type of education service suitable for their needs.

Federal Stimulation of Education for the Handicapped

In recent years the federal government has channeled large amounts of money into stimulating services for handicapped learners. The increase in federal spending for the handicapped has been the result of a series of public laws outlining services for the handicapped and the rights of the handicapped to equal educational opportunities. Public Law 85-905 called for the establishment of a free loan service for the captioned films for the deaf, Public Law 91-230 facilitated the continued development of educational technology in education programs for the handicapped, and most recently in November 1975, Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, guarantees a free appropriate education for all handicapped children, aged three to twenty-one years.

In appraising the impact of federal legislation prior to 1975 for the education of the handicapped it must be concluded that there is a long way to go. The Rand Corporation prepared report R-1420-HEW (1974), which states in analysis of services to the handicapped learners:

> Despite the considerable sums of money expended by government and the private sector, the care and services provided to the nation's handicapped children are deficient in many ways. Many children are still receiving no services, the wrong services, or inadequate services.[1]

The report goes on to examine four major classes of qualitative problems of federally funded service systems for handicapped learners. These problems are broken down as follows:

1. *Inequity* — "There is marked unevenness in the accessibility to, and the level of services. Each program area has large and often extreme variation in per capita expenditures and services delivered across states and among handicaps."
2. *Gaps in Services* — "Even if a full range of services is available . . . the absence of an effective location direction service may cause gaps in the mix of needed services a child receives."
3. *Insufficient Information* — "Looking across all programs at the federal level, for example, no one agency knows for sure how many handicapped children there are, what they need, what services are available to meet those needs, or how effective those services are."
4. *Inadequate Control* — "Policy making fund-

[1] James S. Kakalik and others, *Improving Services to Handicapped Children* (Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, R-1420-HEW, May 1974), p. 14.

ing, and operating decisions are often made by entirely different groups of people, based in each case on an almost total lack of data about program effectiveness; consequently, accountability is generally very weak."[1]

The conclusions of the Rand Report are not surprising as the intent of federal legislation for the education of the handicapped has been to stimulate educational services for the handicapped. The delivery of those services is dependent upon the cooperative planning and implementation by state and local education agencies.

One of the programs sponsored by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) addressed some of the concerns identified in the Rand Report. Since 1974 BEH sponsored the Area Learning Resource Center/Specialized Office/National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped (ALRC/SO/NCEMMH) Program through August 31, 1977, which was a continuation of former similar programs. The result of the activities of the ALRC/SO/NCEMMH Program was the stimulating of state program development for media and materials and related support services to enhance the education of handicapped learners. The federal program developed an articulation of specific activities through coordinating and interfacing national, state, and local efforts. Because of this coordination, the ALRC/SO/NCEMMH Program was one of the few federal programs to report national data about services in a unified expression and format so that an overview of the program's activities was possible. Accountability was provided to the federal government.

The ALRC/SO/NCEMMH program was partially based on the assumption that specialized media and materials services are an intrinsic and necessary component of the comprehensive services required to provide individualized educational programs to meet the educational needs of handicapped learners. Instructional materials have long been part of our instructional system. The Educational Products Information Exchange Institute (EPIE) documented this when a survey of 14,000 elementary and secondary teachers showed that 90 to 95 percent of the teachers reported using some type of instructional material in their daily instruction. Many school personnel are mindful of the fact that appropriate instructional materials are required to provide an adequate educational opportunity for learners. Professionals working in the field of special education, whether in the classroom, the office, or the home, have come to realize the need for appropriate media and materials services in support of the education of the handicapped. The requirements of Public Law 94-142 that each learner with a handicap receive an individualized educational program (IEP) heightens the need for support services to provide adequate and appropriate instructional materials to be used in each individualized program. Media and materials support services have been available through the ALRC/SO/NCEMMH Program for the past three years and although the program structure has been altered by BEH similar support services will be continued in the future.

One of the major components of the former ALRC/SO/NCEMMH program was the National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped (NCEMMH). NCEMMH had these major responsibilities: coordination of specific ALRC/SO/NCEMMH activities; providing information about media and materials suitable for use with handicapped learners; and placing into national distribution unavailable media and materials suitable for use with handicapped learners. This article will address the distribution activities of NCEMMH and provide samples of the instructional materials and technical assistance publications which were published to assist professionals involved in the development of instructional materials for the education of the handicapped.

Instructional Materials

NCEMMH placed unavailable instructional materials into distribution for use by handicapped learners and educators. In a little over four years NCEMMH placed into distribution over 35 instructional materials designed or suitable for use with handicapped learners and educators. These materials were made available through commercial and noncommercial distributors. Information about noncommercially distributed materials was made available through the *NCEMMH Materials Catalog*. Commercially distributed materials were and are advertised by the commercial company distributing the material(s). A sampling of some of the materials placed into distribution is described below:

What Happens When You Steal. Originator: The former Special Education Instructional Materials Center (SEIMC), University of Wisconsin, 1969; revised and reissued by NCEMMH, 1976. Format: One 30-minute cassette tape, with 1,000 Hz inaudible signals for automated projection sys-

[1] James S. Kakalik, p. 15-16

tems and audible signals for manual projection systems; set of 65 color slides; one teacher's guide, iii + 20 pages. Price $14.00. Order from National Audiovisual Center. NAC order number: 007716.

The purpose of this mixed media program is to inform educable mentally retarded students (mental age 8-15 years) of the legal consequences of shoplifting. The teacher's guide contains detailed instructions explaining how to present the material; master copies of a pretest and post-test for the teacher to copy and administer; and a complete script of the slide-tape presentation. The program can be presented in about an hour.

Coping With Menstruation. Originator: Fox Valley Special Education Instructional Materials Center, Oshkosh, Wisconsin, 1974; revised and reissued by NCEMMH, 1975. Format: One set of 29 slides and accompanying audio-tape; three additional audio-tapes; one teacher's manual, vi + 53 pages, including 21 transparency masters. Price $18.00. Order from: National Audiovisual Center. NAC order number: 007714.

The target audience for this kit is educable mentally retarded girls in puberty. The kit teaches self-care hygiene skills. The tapes, slides, and transparencies are for classroom use with students; the manual sets forth behavioral objectives and indicates activities, arranged like lesson plans, that the teacher may use to achieve the objectives. The scripts of material on the tapes appear in the manual. Parent permission forms and suggestions for the use of commercially available materials are also included in the manual.

The self-care skills taught stress the kind of social independence training needed prior to vocational training. Specific behavioral objectives are: Definition of menstruation; use of a sanitary napkin; use of a sanitary belt, panty, and shield; use of a tampon; disposal of tampons and sanitary napkins.

Hi-Fi. Originator: The former Northeast Regional Media Center for the Deaf, 1974; revised and reissued by NCEMMH, 1976. Format: One 7-minute audio-tape cassette; one 12-minute ¾" black and white video-tape; one teacher's manual, xiv + 167 pages and 32 transparency masters. Price: $53.00. Order from: National Audiovisual Center. NAC order number: 007901.

A public school teacher who wants to understand the needs and characteristics of hearing impaired children can learn more about the subject by participating in a special education in-service workshop based on Hi-Fi. By using the materials in the Hi-Fi program, a workshop leader can answer such questions as the following: When hearing impaired children are newly integrated into the public schools, what are their needs? How can the teacher and their fellow students help them to adjust to an unfamiliar environment? What should the teacher consider in planning and implementing their educational program?

The manual, transparency masters, audio-tape, and video-tape all work together in providing a comprehensive in-service program for a workshop aimed at preschool through secondary teachers who may have a hearing impaired child in their classes. (1) The manual presents an overview of mainstreaming, hearing impairment, education of the hearing impaired child in special and regular schools, and orientation of all children to the new classroom situation. In addition, over forty pages of resources provide references to schools, government agencies, organizations, and materials related to the hearing impaired. A bibliography and a list of suggested topics or questions for discussions in the workshop follow each chapter. (2) The transparency masters can be used to illustrate or to prompt discussion about information presented. (3) The audio-tape gives examples of the speech problems of the hearing impaired by presenting several listening simulations and some samples of the speech of children with severe hearing loss. (4) The video-tape, addressed to mainstreamed hearing impaired children, presents a hearing impaired adult explaining his educational experiences to a hearing impaired child.

The initials in the title Hi-Fi derive from the program's original title, "Hearing Impaired Formal In-service Program." The 1976 edition of Hi-Fi was revised and updated by NCEMMH with advice from the original project coordinator, Dr. Linda Nober.

America's Journey Into Space. Originator: The former Midwest Regional Media Center for the Deaf at Lincoln, Nebraska, 1971; reissued by NCEMMH, 1974. Format: Three ten-minute Technicolor Super 8mm cartridge silent captioned films; teacher's manual; 20 copies of child-use workbook. Price: $90.75. Order from: National Audiovisual Center. NAC order number: 007300.

This film discusses the early steps in man's exploration of space. The three-part series is designed to provide the student with an introduction

to the launching, orbit, and recovery of a spacecraft. It is specifically designed for hearing impaired students so that they may have a better understanding of commercial telecasts associated with the space program. Gives a basic reading vocabulary of fifty words and phrases associated with the topic. The package is intended for use with the deaf in grades 7-11, or for children without hearing impairment who are at about the fifth or sixth grade level.

Parent-Child Communication: A Mediated Program Designed to Facilitate Communication Between Parents and Their Deaf Children. Originated by the former Northeast Regional Media Center for the Deaf and reissued by NCEMMH in 1974. Format: 45 overhead transparencies and a facilitative manual with bibliography. Price: $30.00. Order from: National Audiovisual Center. NAC order number: 009332.

The program has two major physical components: (1) The open-ended transparencies are designed to stimulate discussion; their importance lies in the interaction that they encourage between parents and group facilitators, thus enabling the suggestion of specific parent behavior. (2) The facilitator's manual guides the group leader in the use of the transparencies. Statements of objectives, suggested grouping, strategies, sequences of activities, and checklists for evaluation are included.

Teaching Sight Words Using the Kinesthetic Method. Originally produced by the former Special Education Instructional Materials Center of the University of Kansas in 1972, this instructional material was revised and reissued by NCEMMH in 1976. Format: One color filmstrip; one ten-minute audio cassette tape equipped for use with automatic or manual projection systems; teacher's guide, v + 20 pages. Price: $9.00. Order from National Audiovisual Center. NAC order number: 007717.

This program explains how to teach a child with learning difficulties to recognize sight words by using a kinesthetic method that employs Grace Fernald's techniques. The method can be used in elementary to junior high levels.

The material is designed for use in college and university teacher training courses at graduate and undergraduate levels. It could also be used at workshops, seminars, and in-service classes for teachers or parents. The teacher's guide contains a description of the frames in the filmstrip, accompanied by a complete script of the audio cassette.

In order to reinforce the materials explained in the filmstrip, the presentation should be followed by a simulated training activity that is introduced in the filmstrip and outlined in detail in the teacher's guide. This guide also contains instructions and masters for preparing materials to be used in the simulation. The new Edgar Dale 333-Word Basic Vocabulary List was specifically prepared for publication in this guide, where it appears for the first time.

Workshop: Creating Instructional Materials for Handicapped Learners. This kit was originated by the former Northwest Special Education Instructional Materials Center of the University of Oregon in 1974; one filmstrip and the accompanying audio cassette were originally produced by the Special Education Development Center of Hunter College-City University of New York. Reissued in 1975 by NCEMMH. Format: Three audio cassettes; two color filmstrips; 117-page coordinator's guide for a workshop leader. Price: $20.00. Order from: National Audiovisual Center. NAC order number: 009688.

This product has two main purposes — to show teachers how to create materials for teaching handicapped learners, and to guide teachers in selecting, evaluating, adapting, and using commercial materials for educating handicapped learners. It is intended for use in an in-service workshop.

The workshop at which the material is presented should take two sessions. Session I, on adapting and improvising instructional materials, requires a day. Session II, on evaluating instructional materials, should follow two weeks later and can be accomplished in an evening.

The coordinator's guide includes master copies of activity sheets to be duplicated and distributed to workshop participants. It also contains the complete scripts for the other components of the kit: "Selecting Instructional Materials," a seven-minute audio cassette and filmstrip; "Creativity," a 13-minute audio cassette; and "Educating Young Handicapped Children: Getting the Most Out of Materials," a 15-minute audio cassette and filmstrip.

All of the materials described are available from the National Audiovisual Center. to order write: NATIONAL AUDIOVISUAL CENTER, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C. 20409.

Technical Assistance Publications

An additional primary service available from the National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped was its technical assistance service. The Center provided a variety of information services and responses to thousands of inquiries as well as produced several resource publications designed to help instructional material developers make better products for use with handicapped learners. Information about some of these publications follow.

The *Developer's Guide: Preparing Materials for Distribution*, published by NCEMMH in July 1976, was produced to provide assistance to instructional materials developers who plan to enter their materials into distribution. The guide outlines the essential points and considerations a developer must do or be aware of during the development of a material in order to assure its distribution feasibility. The guide lists these key points:

- Research the field to determine that there is a need for the material.
- Have objectives clearly in mind when preparing the material, and set up a testing and validation procedure to make sure that the objectives are accomplished.
- Define the target population, and address the material to this population.
- Let the audience addressed add the information to be conveyed determine the media used.
- Prepare manuscripts in accordance with standard stylistic practices.
- Prepare camera-ready artwork in accordance with professional practices.
- Develop and produce the material so that its potential benefit to the user justifies its potential price.
- Avoid media that require the user to obtain unusual or costly equipment.
- Use a high definition (professional) format for masters of audiovisual material.
- Use a standard format for audiovisual masters to avoid the need for adaptation.
- Seek editorial, artistic, and technical assistance when preparing materials.
- Become familiar with copyright protections and requirements.
- Weigh carefully the advantages of obtaining a copyright.
- Secure permission to use copyright material.
- Obtain talent releases from all persons photographed, filmed, or recorded in the course of producing the material.
- Comply with all requirements for clearances by the federal government if the material is developed with federal funds.

The *Developer's Guide* is available from the Publications Sales Division, Ohio State University Press, 2070 Neil Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210, for $2.50.

The *Standard Criteria for the Selection and Evaluation of Instructional Material* was widely distributed by NCEMMH and is in use by many administrators, teachers, librarians, and media specialists. Over the years, different rationales and systems have been developed to assist the educator in the selection and evaluation of instructional materials. Many educators, not having access to well-developed systems for selecting and evaluating instructional materials, devised their own selection and evaluation processes at the classroom or building level. While it is helpful to have multiple systems to choose from so that specific learner needs can be met in different instructional settings, the question has been asked throughout the educational community: "What criteria do you use for the selection and evaluation of instructional materials?"

The question of appropriate criteria was addressed by the former Special Education Instructional Materials Centers and Regional Media Centers Program (SEIMC/RMC Program) sponsored by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) from 1966 to 1974. The work of establishing a listing of criteria statements has been continued by the present Area Learning Resource Center, Specialized Office, and National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped Program (ALRC/SO/NCEMMH Program) also sponsored by BEH. The sets of *Standard Criteria for the Selection and Evaluation of Instructional Material* is the result of the efforts of both programs. The criteria were developed for application at two levels: teacher, for assistance in selecting and evaluating materials for individual learners; and national, for assistance in selecting and evaluating materials for groups of learners.

The criteria statements are not intended to be an exhaustive listing, but rather to be the basic and necessary considerations essential to the appropriate selection and evaluation of instructional materials. It is anticipated that the use of the criteria may identify other types of statements or questions that may be used to identify an appropriate instructional material for use with an

individual learner. Potential users of the criteria are urged to investigate other instructional materials selection and evaluation criteria and/or systems and to be aware of local or state requirements, if any, for the selection and evaluation of instructional materials.

Guidelines for the Representation of Exceptional Persons in Educational Material, published by NCEMMH in April 1977. The guidelines were produced by a consortium representing the Council for Exceptional Children, the Area Learning Resource Centers, the Association of American Publishers, the National Audiovisual Association, the Association of Media Producers, the White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals, the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped, the fields of special educational and curriculum development, and the National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped. The intent of the guidelines is to assure that print and non-print educational materials reflect a positive, fair, and balanced representation of persons with exceptionalities. Excerpts of the guidelines follow:

1. In print and non-print educational materials, 10 percent of the contents should include or represent children or adults with an exceptionality.
2. Representation of persons with exceptionalities should be included in materials at all levels (early childhood through adult) and in all areas of study.
3. The representation of persons with exceptionalities should be accurate and free from stereotypes.
4. Persons with exceptionalities should be shown in the best restrictive environment. They should be participating in activities in a manner that will include them as part of society.
5. In describing persons with exceptionalities, the language used should be non-discriminatory and free from value judgments.
6. Persons with exceptionalities and persons without exceptionalities should be shown interacting in ways that are mutually beneficial.
7. Materials should provide a variety of appropriate role models of persons with exceptionalities.
8. Emphasis should be on uniqueness and worth of all persons, rather than on the differences between persons with and without exceptionalities.
9. Tokenism should be avoided in the representation of persons with exceptionalities.

Initial distribution of the guidelines was done by NCEMMH to over 2,000 publishers and distributors, nationally and internationally. NCEMMH subsequently received requests for multiple copies of the guidelines from domestic and international agencies. Complete copies of the guidelines may be obtained free of charge from: Angele Thomas, Exceptional Children, Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091.

Those wishing more information about the guidelines or wishing to order by phone may do so by calling toll free (800) 336-3728. Please ask for Angele Thomas.

It is evident from the small amount of information presented in this article that the ALRC/SO/NCEMMH Program has been influencial in providing significant media and materials support services to educators throughout the nation. The future of the ALRC/SO/NCEMMH program is uncertain, but whatever future similar activities are supported by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, they will have a firm base of expertise and service to build on as a result of the ALRC/SO/NCEMMH Program.

The efforts, publications, materials, and services discussed in this article have been the result of years of work of many professionals laboring behind the scenes so that the education of handicapped learners might be enhanced. The effectiveness of their work depends not only on the availability of the resources they developed, but on the utilization of the resources by educators concerned with the improvement of educational services for handicapped learners.

Portions of this article are excerpted from NCEMMH publications.

standard criteria for the selection and evaluation of instructional material

The National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped (NCEMMH) in cooperation with the national system of learning resource centers, professional associations, various other public and private agencies, and interested individuals provides a comprehensive program of activities to facilitate the use of new educational technology in instructional programs for handicapped persons. NCEMMH provides leadership and service in the development, design, and dissemination of learning resources that are effective for the handicapped. The Center is funded under Contract OEC-300-72-4478 by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The contract is administered through the College of Education and the Research Foundation of The Ohio State University.

This document was prepared pursuant to a contract with the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express their judgment freely in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Duplication of the criteria, as distributed by NCEMMH, is permitted.

TEACHER LEVEL

I. IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

The outcome of stage I will be: a definition of the target learner and the learning environment prior to any selection of suitable instructional materials.

A. Learner Characteristics

(The following outline is intended to serve as a guideline to the selector of instructional materials in identifying the characteristics and educational requirements of the specific learner for whom material is being sought.)

1. Has an assessment of the learner occurred, and does the resulting data specify:
   a. demographic information about the learner, including:

Yes	No	NA	
____	____	____	(1) age
____	____	____	(2) sex
____	____	____	(3) instructional / developmental level
____	____	____	(4) language development or preference
____	____	____	(5) interest level
____	____	____	b. limiting conditions (medical/physical factors, etc.)
____	____	____	c. behavioral/affective characteristics
____	____	____	d. preferred modalities
____	____	____	e. strength areas
____	____	____	f. deficit areas

2. Has an educational plan been developed, based on learner assessment data, which specifies:

____	____	____	a. needed skill area
____	____	____	b. short and long-term instructional objectives
____	____	____	c. instructional strategies, including:
____	____	____	(1) sequencing

Prepared by the ALRC/SO/NCEMMH Program. Distributed by NCEMMH, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210.

___ ___ ___ (2) reinforcement
___ ___ ___ (3) modalities (input/output)
___ ___ ___ (4) monitoring

d. recommendations for:

___ ___ ___ (1) general instructional areas
___ ___ ___ (2) specific materials
___ ___ ___ (3) related activities

B. Program Characteristics

(The following outline is intended to serve as a guideline to the selector of instructional materials in identifying the overall program considerations with the specific learner(s) and learning requirements in mind.)

Yes No NA

1. Have provisions been made for integration of the individual educational plan into the total instructional program:

___ ___ ___ a. content
___ ___ ___ b. curricular compatibility
___ ___ ___ c. format/alternatives

2. Would implementation of the educational plan be affected by any of the following environmental constraints:

___ ___ ___ a. time/cost/physical considerations
___ ___ ___ b. grouping
___ ___ ___ c. equipment
___ ___ ___ d. personnel
___ ___ ___ e. teacher skill

II. INITIAL SELECTION

The outcome of stage II will be: the identification of at least two pieces of instructional material which, on first screening, appear compatible with learner requirements and which will be considered for further review. Identification of alternative materials for examination will facilitate final selection decisions on a comparative basis.

A. Search

(The items listed below outline the most common information resources available to the selector of instructional materials. The intent of this section is to encourage the user to investigate various potential materials information sources.)

1. Have you located resources which might provide information about materials:

___ a. colleagues
___ b. commercial
___ c. materials bibliographies
___ d. journals
___ e. curriculum libraries and centers (colleges, schools for handicapped, learning resource centers)
___ f. professional organizations
___ g. governmental agencies (national network, audiovisual center, etc.)
___ h. information systems (NIMIS, EPIE, ERIC, etc)

2. As a result of the above process, have you identified at least two instructional materials which appear to address the learner's needs?

B. Screen

(Under optimal conditions, a written product abstract or review will provide information pertaining to all of the items listed below, so that actual inspection of the product is not necessary. In the absence of thorough and accurate material descriptions, however, scrutiny of the material itself will be required.

A secondary intent of this section is to educate both material users and material abstractors [including commercial publishers] about desirable elements to be included in product reviews.)

1. Does the material information resource provide information about the identified instructional product(s), such as:

Yes	No	NA	
____	____	____	a. instructional level
____	____	____	b. language level
____	____	____	c. interest level
____	____	____	d. sensory input and output modalities
____	____	____	e. educational subject/skill content
____	____	____	f. format
____	____	____	g. cost
____	____	____	h. grouping requirement(s)
____	____	____	i. required equipment

2. On the basis of the available information, does the identified instructional material appear compatible with:

____	____	____	a. learner characteristics
____	____	____	(1) the learner assessment
____	____	____	(2) the learner educational plan
____	____	____	b. program characteristics
____	____	____	(1) the total instructional program considerations
____	____	____	(2) the identified environmental constraints

III. REVIEW

The outcome of stage III will be: an in depth analysis of an instructional material in order to define the material's characteristics and match these characteristics to previously defined learner requirements. Implementation of this stage necessitates actual examination of the instructional material.

A. Analysis of Material

(This section includes recommended questions for determining the intrinsic qualities of the material[s] independent of specific learner characteristics and program requirements.)

Yes	No	NA	
____	____	____	1. Are objectives in behavioral terms (specifying what the student task is, under what conditions, and level of performance expected)?
____	____	____	2. Are techniques of instruction for each lesson either clearly specified or self-evident?
____	____	____	3. Are facts, concepts, and principles ordered in a logical manner (e.g., chronologically, easy to difficult, etc.)?
____	____	____	4. Does the material contain appropriate supplementary or alternative activities that contribute to or extend proposed learning?
____	____	____	5. Is repetition and review of content material systematic and appropriately spaced?
____	____	____	6. Does the content appear accurate?
____	____	____	7. Does the material avoid content which betrays prejudice, perpetuates stereotypes, or neglects the talents, contributions, or aspirations of any segment of the population?
____	____	____	8. Can the material be readily adapted to meet individual learner differences in abilities and interests?
____	____	____	9. Can pacing of the material be adapted to variations in learner rate of mastery?
____	____	____	10. Is provision made for adapting, altering, or combining input and response modalities according to learner variations?
____	____	____	11. Does the material incorporate evaluation items and procedures which are compatible with program objectives?
____	____	____	12. Are there sufficient evaluative items to accurately assess student progress?

___ ___ ___ 13. Is performance assessed frequently enough to allow accurate assessment of student progress and continuous feedback to learner?
___ ___ ___ 14. Is the format uncluttered, grammatically correct, and free of typographical errors?
___ ___ ___ 15. Are illustrations and photographs clear, attractive, and appropriate to content?
___ ___ ___ 16. Are auditory components of adequate clarity and amplification?
___ ___ ___ 17. Are all necessary components either provided with the material or readily and inexpensively available?
___ ___ ___ 18. Can consumable portions of material be easily and inexpensively replaced or legally reproduced?
___ ___ ___ 19. Is cost reasonable in comparison with similar commercial materials or homemade alternatives?
___ ___ ___ 20. Does the publisher clearly state the rationale for selection of program elements, content, and methodology (e.g., choice may be based on tradition, survey of other materials, logic of subject matter, experimental evidence, unvalidated theory)?
___ ___ ___ 21. Are testimonials, research, and publisher claims clearly differentiated?
___ ___ ___ 22. Are reinforcement procedures and schedules clearly indicated?
___ ___ ___ 23. Is a variety of cuing and prompting techniques used?

B. Matching Material to Learner

(This section involves the integration of the identified learner needs with the analyzed material characteristics to determine compatibility for instructional purposes.)

Yes No NA

___ ___ ___ 1. Are stated objectives and scope of the material compatible with learner's need?
___ ___ ___ 2. Are prerequisite student skills/abilities needed to work comfortably and successfully with the material specified and compatible with the learner's characteristics?
___ ___ ___ 3. Are the skills and abilities needed by the instructor to work effectively with the material specified and compatible with instructor's expertise?
___ ___ ___ 4. Are levels of interest, abstraction, vocabulary, and sentence structure compatible with characteristics of the learner?
___ ___ ___ 5. Is the degree of required teacher involvement (constant interaction, supportive or monitoring role, largely student directed, variable) compatible with teacher resources and learner characteristics?
___ ___ ___ 6. Does the material incorporate motivational devices to sustain student interest which are appropriate to the learner's characteristics?
___ ___ ___ 7. Are input and output modalities (visual, auditory, motor, tactile) compatible with learner characteristics?
___ ___ ___ 8. Is the demonstration of task mastery (e.g., written test, performance test, oral test) compatible with or adaptable to intended learner's characteristics?
___ ___ ___ 9. Is the format of the material (e.g., game, book, filmstrip, etc.) compatible with the learner's mental and physical abilities?
___ ___ ___ 10. Is the durability and safety of the material adequate for the learner?
___ ___ ___ 11. Is information provided indicating (successful) field testing of the material with students similar in learning characteristics and interests to those of the learner?

IV. DECISION MAKING

The outcome of stage IV will be: a final determination of material suitability for use in a specific learning situation. Individualization of the decision making, based on items of priority concern, is implicit in this process.

A. As a result of the review process, which questions have you identified as (most) critical to you in deciding to utilize the material with the learner?
B. On the basis of those critical priority concerns, is the material appropriate for specified learning requirements?
___ Yes (implies accept)

____ No (implies reject)
____ Unsure (requires more analysis)

C. If unsure of appropriateness, are there other less critical questions which could be considered in making the decision to utilize the material?

D. On the basis of those additional considerations, is the material now deemed appropriate for specified learning requirements?
____ Yes
____ Unsure

E. If still unsure of appropriateness of the material, will comparison with other previewed material(s), in relation to critical questions, help identify the material which most closely approximates the specified learning requirements?

F. If still unsure of the appropriateness of the material, would modifications of the material render it usable?
1. Do you have access to resources for required modification?

G. If no:
1. Return to search process. Reexamine sources of material identification and information in locating other potential materials.
2. Review learner characteristics in an effort to modify requirements for material.

NATIONAL LEVEL

I. IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

The outcome of stage I will be: identification of the availability and adequacy of sources of need information prior to any selection of suitable instructional materials.

A. Sources

____ 1. The National Needs Assessment sponsored by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
____ 2. Consumers who are currently working with handicapped children
____ 3. Analysis of curriculums and instructional priorities at Learner Level
____ 4. Analysis of learner characteristics
____ 5. Availability of appropriate materials for curricular areas
____ 6. Availability of effective materials for learners

II. INITIAL SELECTION

The outcome of stage II will be: the identification of at least ten pieces of instructional material which, on first screening, appear compatible with learner requirements and which will be considered for further review. Identification of alternate materials for examination will facilitate final selection decisions on a comparative basis.

A. Search

(The items listed below encourage the user to investigate various potential materials information sources and to consider essential points when gathering information about materials.)

Yes	No	NA	
____	____	____	1. Have you identified resources for materials which have potential use with the handicapped?
____	____	____	2. Have materials been identified which may be appropriate for the learner characteristics of the handicapped?
____	____	____	3. Have materials been identified which may be appropriate for the curricular needs of the handicapped?

B. Screen

(Under optimal conditions, a written product abstract or review will provide information pertaining to all of the items listed below, so that actual inspection of the product is not necessary. In the absence

of thorough and accurate material descriptions, however, scrutiny of the material itself will be required.)

Yes	No	NA		
____	____	____	1.	Is it a learner-use material?
____	____	____	2.	Is it an instructor-use material?
____	____	____	3.	Are all components of the material available?
____	____	____	4.	Does the material have potential for use with the handicapped?
____	____	____	5.	Is the material designed for use by the handicapped?
____	____	____	6.	Does the material appear to be practical to use with the handicapped?
____	____	____	7.	Does the material appear to be easily usable by the handicapped?
____	____	____	8.	Is the format of the material appropriate for the target handicapped audience?
____	____	____	9.	Is the material of acceptable technical quality?
____	____	____	10.	Does the material have instructional objectives?
____	____	____	11.	Does the material appear to meet the curricular needs of the handicapped target population?
____	____	____	12.	How does the cost of the material affect the accessibility to the material?
____	____	____	13.	Does the material appear to present any physical danger to the target handicapped audience?

III. REVIEW

The outcome of stage III will be: an in depth analysis of an instructional material in order to match (section D) the material for use with a specific student based on section A, Learner Characteristics, section B, Teacher Requirements, and section C, Materials Characteristics. Implementation of this stage necessitates actual examination of the instructional material.

A. Learner Characteristics

(The following outline is intended to serve as a guideline to the selector of instructional materials in identifying the characteristics and educational requirements of the specific learner for whom material is being sought.)

1. What are the possible modes of input?
   - ____ auditory
   - ____ visual
   - ____ tactile
   - ____ kinesthetic
2. What are the preferred modes of input?
   - ____ auditory
   - ____ visual
   - ____ tactile
   - ____ kinesthetic
   - ____ multisensory
3. What are the possible modes of response?
   - ____ verbal
   - ____ written
   - ____ gesture
4. ____ What is the learner's instructional level?
5. ____ What is the learner's interest level?
6. ____ What is the learner's reading level?
7. ____ What is the learner's interest areas?
8. What are the learner's interest/motivation requirements?
   - a. ____ use of a game-type format
   - b. ____ use of humor
   - c. ____ use of a variety of stimuli
   - d. ____ use of suspense
   - e. ____ use of novelty

f. ____ use of an interaction system of instantaneous feedback
g. ____ use of cartoon format
h. ____ use of puppets
i. ____ use of characters

9. ____ What are the learner's entry level skills?
10. ____ What are the learner's reinforcement requirements?

B. Teacher Requirements

(The following outline is intended to serve as a guideline to the selector of instructional materials in identifying the requirements to allow a teacher/instructor to effectively use the material.)

1. ____ Are a teacher's manual and/or instructions provided?
2. If a teacher's manual and/or instructions are provided, does it include:
   a. ____ philosophy and rationale
   b. ____ statement of objectives
   c. ____ statement of instructional and interest levels
   d. ____ statement of reading level
   e. ____ statement of prerequisite skills
   f. ____ listing of material/program elements
   g. ____ listing of required materials and equipment
   h. ____ suggestions for teacher/instructor use
   i. ____ suggestions for student/learner use
   j. ____ suggestions for instructional alternatives
   k. ____ suggestions for evaluation
   l. ____ suggestions for additional resources
3. Instructor time requirements:
   a. ____ training
   b. ____ preparation
   c. ____ use
   d. ____ cleanup
4. What is the degree of instructor involvement?
   a. ____ full-time teacher involvement is required during instructional period
   b. ____ part-time teacher involvement required
   c. ____ no teacher involvement required
   d. ____ full-time aide involvement required
   e. ____ part-time aide involvement required
   f. ____ no aide involvement required
   g. ____ full-time parent involvement required
   h. ____ part-time parent involvement required
   i. ____ no parent involvement required
   j. ____ full-time peer involvement required
   k. ____ part-time peer involvement required
   l. ____ no peer involvement required
   m. ____ materials can be used independently by learners
5. Is the material practical?

Yes	No	NA	
____	____	____	a. maneuverability
____	____	____	b. ease of storage
____	____	____	c. number of parts
____	____	____	d. identification of parts
____	____	____	e. size of parts
____	____	____	f. storage/organization of parts
____	____	____	g. durability of product and packaging

____ ____ ____ h. replaceability of consumable and nonconsumable parts
____ ____ ____ i. requires use of specialized equipment

6. Is the total cost reasonable?

Yes	No	NA	
____	____	____	a. in-service training
____	____	____	b. initial cost
____	____	____	c. per use cost (replacement of consumables)
____	____	____	d. required supplementary materials costs
____	____	____	e. replacement cost (replacement of nonconsumables)

7. ____ ____ ____ Is the material appropriate for the curriculum?
8. ____ ____ ____ Has this material been field tested?
9. ____ ____ ____ If so, has it been found to be effective?

C. Materials Characteristics

(The following outline is intended to serve as a guideline to the selector of instructional materials in identifying specific characteristics a material requires to allow for communication with a learner.)

1. Technical quality
   a. Quality of auditory presentation:

	Acceptable	Unacceptable
(1) clarity (easily understood, recording quality good)	____	____
(2) amplification	____	____
(3) voice level	____	____
(4) dialect/accent	____	____
(5) voice speed	____	____
(6) voice quality	____	____
(7) sequence	____	____
(8) quality of narration (reader style)	____	____
(9) music/sound/voice mixing	____	____

   b. Quality of visual presentation:

(1) sharpness	____	____
(2) color	____	____
(3) distracting elements	____	____
(4) complexity	____	____
(5) size relationships	____	____
(6) sequence	____	____
(7) subjective angle (learner point of view)	____	____
(8) objective angle (observer point of view)	____	____
(9) composition (visual format, visual arrangement)	____	____
(10) figure-ground definition	____	____

   c. Quality of print and graphic presentation:

(1) legibility (style and size)	____	____
(2) captioning (location and pacing)	____	____
(3) clarity of print (contrast)	____	____
(4) accuracy	____	____

   d. Quality of tactile presentation:

(1) Braille (clear and easily discriminable)	____	____
(2) tactile drawings (clear and easily discriminable)	____	____
(3) texture (clear and easily discriminable	____	____
(4) composition (physical format, physical arrangement)	____	____
(5) manipulables (discriminable, dimension, shape, mass)	____	____

2. Instructional quality

Yes	No	NA	
____	____	____	a. Does the selection of subject matter facts adequately represent the content area?

___ ___ ___ b. Is the content presented in the material accurate?
___ ___ ___ c. Is the content logically sequenced?
___ ___ ___ d. Is the content organized for ease of study?
___ ___ ___ e. Are various points of view, including treatment of minorities, handicapped, ideologies, personal and social values, sex roles, etc., objectively represented?
___ ___ ___ f. Are the objectives of the material clearly stated?
___ ___ ___ g. Is the content of the material consistent with the objectives?
___ ___ ___ h. Are the prerequisite skills for use of the materials stated?
___ ___ ___ i. Are essential sub-skills required included in the instructional sequence?
___ ___ ___ j. Is the reading level of the material stated?
___ ___ ___ k. Is the vocabulary systematically introduced?
___ ___ ___ l. Is the vocabulary consistent with the stated reading level?
___ ___ ___ m. Is the instructional level stated?
___ ___ ___ n. Is the interest level stated?
___ ___ ___ o. Is the material self-pacing?
___ ___ ___ p. Does the material provide for frequent reinforcement of major concepts?
___ ___ ___ q. Does the material summarize and review major points?
___ ___ ___ r. Does the material provide frequent opportunities for active student involvement and response?
___ ___ ___ s. Does the material provide for evaluation of user performance?
___ ___ ___ t. Does the material provide criterion-referenced assessment?
___ ___ ___ u. Are all of the supplementary materials needed for instruction included in the materials package?

D. Matching Material to Learner

(The following questions require a synthesis of information gained from stage III, Review. The synthesis is essential before proceeding to stage IV, Decision.)

Yes No NA

___ ___ ___ 1. Are the characteristics of the material compatible with perceived learner characteristics?
___ ___ ___ 2. Are the characteristics of the material compatible with perceived teacher requirements?
___ ___ ___ 3. Have you checked the list of criteria in the TEACHER LEVEL, stage III, Review, section B, Matching Material to Learner?

IV. DECISIONS

The outcome of stage IV will be: a final determination of material suitability for use in a specific learning situation. Individualization of the decision making, based on items of priority concern, is implicit in this process.

After the review process, it was found that the material was:

Yes No NI

___ ___ ___ needed by the learner
___ ___ ___ usable with the learner
___ ___ ___ usable by the instructor
___ ___ ___ effective

Decisions to:

A. Use

B. Adapt

C. Field Test

can be made by identifying from the review data responsiveness of the material to learner need, usability with the learner, usability by the instructor, and effectiveness.

Directions: For each criterion met, place a "+" in the appropriate box. For each criterion not met, place a "—" in the appropriate box. If no information is available, place an "NI" in the appropriate box.

Needed	Usable with Learner	Usable by Teacher	Effective

Match your review summary with the decision matrix below:

D. Recommendations

N	UL	UT	E	Recommend for:
+	+	+	+	U — Use/make available for use/information dissemination
+	+	+	—	A — Adapt
+	+	+	NI	U/FT — Use/Field Test
+	+	—	+	R/A/D — Reject/Adapt/Develop
+	+	—	—	R/A/D — Reject/Adapt/Develop
+	—	—	—	R/A/D — Reject/Adapt/Develop
+	—	+	—	R/A/D — Reject/Adapt/Develop
+	—	+	+	R/A/D — Reject/Adapt/Develop
+	—	+	NI	R/A/D — Reject/Adapt/Develop
—	+	+	+	R — Reject/not acceptable
—	—	+	+	R — Reject/not acceptable
—	—	—	+	R — Reject/not acceptable
—	—	—	—	R — Reject/not acceptable
—	—	—	NI	R — Reject/not acceptable

V. EVALUATION

The outcome of stage V will be: a final judgment, either positive, negative, or inconclusive, as to the usefulness and effectiveness of the material with the learner in a given learning situation.

Yes	No	NA	
____	____	____	1. Does this material meet the requirements of the teacher? (see teacher requirement section in review instrument)
____	____	____	2. Does this material meet the requirements of the learner? (see learner characteristics section in review instrument)
____	____	____	3. Does this material lead to the attainment of the specified objectives? (see instructional quality section in the review instrument)
____	____	____	4. Does the technical quality of the material meet the requirements of the learner? (see technical quality section in review instrument)
____	____	____	5. Do the instructional qualities of the material meet the requirements of the learner? (see instructional quality section of review instrument)

national and illinois agencies concerned with exceptional students

The following listing of national and state agencies that provide services for or have an interest in the education of the exceptional student is not inclusive; rather it can be used as a beginning listing of agencies to which a library or media center could add other state, regional, and local agencies for reference purposes.

Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf
Dr. George W. Fellendorf, Executive Director
3417 Volta Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007

American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation: Physical Education and Recreation for the Handicapped
Julien U. Stein, Director
1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

American Association for the Education of the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped
Lib Harmon, Executive Director
1600 West Armory Way, Seattle, Washington 98119

American Association of Workers for the Blind
Dr. Bruce B. Blasch, Executive Director
1511 K. Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005

American Association on Mental Deficiency
Dr. Albert Serkowitz, Executive Director
5201 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20015

American Brotherhood for the Blind
Jean Dyon Norris, Director
Twin Vision Publishing Division
18440 Oxnard Street, Tarzana, California 91356

American Dental Association
Dr. C. Gordon Watson, Executive Director
211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60611

American Diabetes Association
J. Richard Connelly, Executive Director
18 East 48th Street, New York, New York 10017

American Diabetes Association of Greater Chicago
Nike Whitcomb, Executive Director
620 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60611

American Foundation for the Blind
Loyal Eugene Apple, Executive Director
15 West 16th Street, New York, New York 10011

American Medical Association
Dr. James H. Sammon, Executive Vice President
535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60610

American National Red Cross Heart of Illinois Division
John McDivitt, Manager
1224 North Berkeley Avenue, Peoria, Illinois 61603

American Occupational Therapy Association
Leo C. Fanning, Executive Director
Suite 200, 6000 Executive Boulevard
Rockville, Maryland 20852

American Physical Therapy Association
Royce P. Noland, Executive Director
1156 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005

American Speech and Hearing Association
Kenneth O. Johnson, Executive Secretary
9030 Old Georgetown Road, Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Association for Childhood Education International
Director
3615 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20016

Association for Children with Learning Disabilities
Jean Petersen, Secretary
5225 Grace Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15236

Association for Education of the Visually Handicapped
Mary K. Bauman, Executive Secretary
Fourth Floor, 919 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

Association for Individual Development
Barbara Phillips, Director
P.O. Box 552, 309 West New Indian Trail Court
Aurora, Illinois 60507

Association of Rehabilitation Facilities
Director
Suite 955, 5530 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20015

Blind Services Association
Beatrice Fredman, Executive Director
Room 1628, 127 North Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60602

California Association for Neurologically Handicapped Children
Director
P.O. Box 4088, Los Angeles, California 90051

Catholic Charities
Dr. Angela Chemazar, Director
126 North Des Plaines, Chicago, Illinois 60606

Centers and Services for Deaf/Blind Children
Robert Dantona
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202

Chicago Lighthouse for the Blind
Milton J. Samuelson, Associate Director
1850 West Roosevelt Road, Chicago, Illinois 60608

Chicago Public Library, Department of Books and the Physically Handicapped
Jerry Obrochta, Acting Director
Illinois Regional Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped
4544 North Lincoln Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60625

Chicago Speech and Hearing Association
Libby Mages, President
Northeastern Illinois University
5500 North St. Louis, Chicago, Illinois 60625

Council for Exceptional Children
William Geer, Executive Director
1920 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091

Department of Children and Family Services: State of Illinois
Donald H. Schlosser, Director
623 East Adams, Springfield, Illinois 62701

Department of Corrections: State of Illinois
Charles J. Rowe, Director
201 Armory Building, Springfield, Illinois 62706

Juvenile Section
Ray Quick
400 Armory Building

Adult Section
Clark Esarey, Superintendent of Corrections School District
301 Armory Building

Department of Human Services Commission: State of Illinois
Cecil Partee, Assistant Director
640 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60610

Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities: State of Illinois
Dr. Leroy Levitt, Director
Room 401, State Office Building, Springfield, Illinois 62706

Department of Vocational Rehabilitation: State of Illinois
James S. Jeffers, Director
623 East Adams, Springfield, Illinois 62701

Dialogue (a recorded publication for the visually impaired)
Donald O. Nold, Executive Director
3100 Oak Park Avenue, Berwyn, Illinois 60402

Division of Physically Handicapped, Homebound and Hospitalized: Council for Exceptional Children
Clarissa Hug
1600 Hinman Avenue, Evanston, Illinois 60201

Division of Services for Crippled Children: University of Illinois
Dr. Edward F. Lis
540 Isles Park Place, Springfield, Illinois 62703

Dyslexia Memorial Institute
Dr. George E. Parks, Director
1936 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60616

Federation Employment and Guidance Service
Roland Baxt, Executive Director
215 Park Avenue, South, New York, New York 10003

Fund for Perceptually Handicapped Children
President
Box 656, Evanston, Illinois 60204

Girl Scouts of the United States of America
Dr. Cecily C. Selby, Executive Director
830 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10002

Goodwill Industries of America
Mathew Warren, Director of Public Relations
9200 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014

Governor's Committee on Handicapped: State of Illinois
Silas P. Singh, Executive Director
Box 1581, 622 East Washington, Springfield, Illinois 62701

Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities: State of Illinois
Ray Ramirez, Chairperson
222 South College, Springfield, Illinois 62706

Human Growth Foundation
John L. Hickley, President
28 Sylvia Lane, Plainview, New York 11803

Illinois Alliance for Exceptional Children
Sally Hoerr, President
515 West Giles, Peoria, Illinois 61614

Illinois Association for Retarded Citizens
Elaine M. Hoff, Assistant Executive Director
Room 508, Ridgely Building, 504 East Monroe
Springfield, Illinois 62701

Illinois Association of Head Start Directors
Frank G. McGehee, Chairperson
640 North LaSalle, Chicago, Illinois 60610

Illinois Association for Parents of Deaf/Blind
Al Sanders, President
6336 Beechwood, Matteson, Illinois 60443

Illinois Association of School Nurses
Elizabeth Camphor Hall, President
588 Sharon Way, Bolingbrook, Illinois 60439

Illinois Association of School Social Workers
Marguerite Tiefenthal, President
4544 Grand Avenue, Western Springs, Illinois 60558

Illinois Administrators of Special Education
Gaydon Brandt, President
1131 Dee Road, Park Ridge, Illinois 60068

Illinois Commission on Children
Naomi Hiett, Executive Director
Room 206, 3 West Old State Capitol Plaza
Springfield, Illinois 62701

Illinois Consultation of Ethnicity in Education
Luba V. Toloczko, Chairperson
Suite 1880, 55 East Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Illinois Council for Children with Learning Disabilities
Dorothy Ellis, President
2229 West Winnebago Drive, Peoria, Illinois 61614

Illinois Council for Exceptional Children
Dr. Pamela Gillet, President
6958 Hamilton Drive, Niles, Illinois 60648

Illinois Council for the Gifted
Sue Zeiser, President
Northwestern Gifted Institute
2003 Sheridan Road, Evanston, Illinois 60201

Illinois Council for the Hearing Impaired
Frank Sullivan, President
1300 West Northwest Highway, Mount Prospect, Illinois 60056

Illinois Psychological Association
Robert P. Barrell, President
P.O. Box 11229, 161 East Erie, Chicago, Illinois 60611

Illinois Speech and Hearing Association
Peter D. Payne, Educational Director
School of Speech and Hearing Sciences
Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois 61625

Illinois State Society for Autistic Children
Rita Boyle, President
324 Sycamore Street, Naperville, Illinois 60540

Illinois Teachers of Hearing Impaired
Pat MacAnnaly, President
Fairchild Hall, Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois 61761

Illinois Visually Handicapped Institute
Tom Murphy, Superintendent
1141 South Woods, Chicago, Illinois 60622

International Association of Rehabilitation Centers
Charles L. Roberts, Executive Director
5530 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20015

Institute for the Study of Developmental Disabilities
Dr. Tong-He Koh, Director of Training
1640 West Roosevelt Road, Chicago, Illinois 60608

Jewish Children's Bureau of Chicago
Edythe M. Jastram, Executive Director
One South Franklin Street, Chicago, Illinois 60606

Lions of Illinois Foundation
Norman Dahl, Executive Director
1515 North Harlem Avenue, Oak Park, Illinois 60302

Lutheran Social Service of Illinois
Dorothy Trebat, Director of Educational Services
400 West Dickens, Chicago, Illinois 60614

Muscular Dystrophy Association of America
Robert Ross, Executive Director
810 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10019

National Association for Down's Syndrome
Lucille Msall, President
529 South Kenilworth, Oak Park, Illinois 60304

National Association for Gifted Children
Director
Box 630-A, Hot Springs, Arkansas 71901

National Association of the Deaf
Frederick C. Schreiber, Executive Secretary
814 Thayer Avenue, Silver Springs, Maryland 20910

National Association of Hearing and Speech Agencies
Tom Coleman, Executive Director
814 Thayer Avenue, Silver Springs, Maryland 20910

National Association of the Physically Handicapped
Mary Ellen Howard, Vice President
6437 Grandville, Detroit, Michigan 48228

National Association for Retarded Citizens
Dr. Phillip Roos, Executive Director
P.O. Box 6109, 2709 Avenue E. East, Arlington, Texas 76011

National Braille Association
Mrs. Irvin F. Richman, President
9555 Central Park Avenue, Evanston, Illinois 60203

National Committee for Citizens in Education
Carl L. Marburger, Senior Associate
Suite 410, Wilde Lake Village Green
Columbia, Maryland 21044

National Easter Seal Society for Crippled Children and Adults
Jane Shover, Executive Director
2023 West Ogden Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60612

National Epilepsy League
Stephen C. Pietsch, Executive Director
6 North Michigan, Chicago, Illinois 60602

National Industries for the Blind
Noel B. Price, Vice President
1455 Broad Street, Bloomfield, New Jersey 07003

National Multiple Sclerosis Society
Sylvia Lawry, Executive Director
205 East 42nd Street, New York, New York 10017

National Paraplegia Foundation
Arthur Steich, Executive Director
333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60601

Northern Illinois Planning Commission for Gifted Children
Diana Peters
Wild Rose School, Box 188, St. Charles, Illinois 60174

Pilot Guide Dog Foundation
Dawn Myers, Executive Secretary
33 East Congress Parkway, Chicago, Illinois 60605

President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped
Bernard Posner, Executive Director
Room 636, Vanguard Building
1111 - 20tn Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago
Dr. Henry Betts, Director
345 East Superior Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611

Shriner's Hospital for Crippled Children
Gene E. Yeazell, Administrator
2211 North Oak Park Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60635

State Advisory Council on Education of Handicapped Children (to the State Board of Education)
Mrs. Gordon (D[illegible]) Hallstrom, Chairperson
Illinois Office of Education
100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois 62777

United Cerebral Palsy: Illinois Division
Jane E. Chapin, Executive Director
309 South Third Street, Springfield, Illinois 62701

United Cerebral Palsy Association
Earl H. Cunnerd, Executive Director
66 East 34th Street, New York, New York 10016

United Parents for Exceptional Children
Robert Bevan LaBeau, Director
165 Mohawk Drive, Bourbonnais, Illinois 60914

directory, illinois state library
area code 217

Gesterfield, Kathryn J.	*Director*	782-2994
Beasley, James	*Associate Director for Library Programs*	782-5012
Kirk, Sherwood	*Associate Director for Library Operations*	782-5524
Van Zanten, Frank	*Associate Director for Library Development*	782-7848
Adams, Stanley	*Information Specialist*	782-5013
Bostian, Irma	*Editor, Illinois Libraries*	782-5870
Brennan, Edward	*Head, Library Accounting*	782-3504
Collins, Margaret	*Consultant for Library Development*	782-7848
Cook, Garnetta	*Head, Audiovisual Section*	782-6683
DeJohn, William	*Senior Consultant, Library Cooperation*	782-7848
Dilley, Richard	*Head, Serials Section*	782-5506
Ensley, Robert	*Senior Consultant, Services to Institutions and Physically Handicapped*	782-7848
Field, Mary Kate	*Government Reference Librarian*	782-5430
Groninger, Margaret L.	*General Reference Librarian*	782-7596
Halcli, Albert	*Assistant Director for Public Services*	782-5013
Harris, Walter	*Assistant Director for Management*	782-3504
Henderson, Christine	*Government Reference Librarian*	782-5430
Herman, Margaret	*Head, Collection Development Branch*	782-7791
Horney, Joyce	*Head, Circulation and Special Services Branch*	782-5823
Lamont, Bridget L.	*Senior Consultant, Services to Children and Young Adults*	782-7848
Lyons, Janet	*Head, Government Documents Branch*	782-5185
Quint, Mary D.	*Senior Consultant, Library Manpower*	782-7848
Redmond, Mary	*Head, Legislative and General Reference and Information Branch*	782-5430
Rothwell, Pauline	*Head, Binding Section*	782-4887
Schwartz, Arlene	*Coordinator for Field Services, ILLINET Bibliographic Data Base Service*	782-3553
Sharma, Ramesh	*Head, Library Materials Processing Branch*	782-7612
Spencer, Richard	*Administrative Programs Assistant*	782-7848
Tyer, Travis	*Senior Consultant, Professional Development*	782-7848
Vrooman, Hugh	*Systems Analysis and Management Services*	782-7845